THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 47,386

VOLUME THE TWENTY-FIRST.

October 1909 – September 1910.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

Printed by

MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON	SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
MANCHESTER	JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK	CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXI.

AUTHORS.

Professor JOHN QUINCY ADAMS— PAGE
'Worthily' 522

Ven. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., D.Sc., D.D.—
The Alleged Catholicism of the First Gospel and its Date 439

Rev. H. J. DUKINFIELD ASTLEY, M.A., Litt.D.—
The Foundation Sacrifice . . . 139

Rev. H. H. B. AYLES, D.D.—
2 Corinthians 3^{17} 90

Rev. C. J. BALL, M.A.—
Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype? 91
Cushan-rishathaim 192
John 2^{19} 281

Rev. Professor J. S. BANKS, D.D.—
The Disciples and Christ's Resurrection 419

GEORGE A. BARTON, A.M., Ph.D.—
Another View of Professor Hilprecht's Fragment of a Deluge Tablet . . 504

Dr. JULIUS BOEHMER—
The Cursing of the Fig-Tree . . 328

Rev. ANDREW N. BOGLE, M.A.—
The Book with the Seven Seals . . 120

Rabbi A. BÜCHLER, Ph.D.—
The Law of Purification in Mark $7^{1\text{-}23}$. 34

Rev. H. BULCOCK, B.A., D.D.—
John $12^{32\text{-}36}$. 333

Bishop G. A. CHADWICK, DD.—
The Coat without Seam . . . 567

Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A.—
The Prophet's Profit 138

Professor ALBERT CONDAMIN, S.J.—
The 'Vulgate' of Professor Henslow . 330

Rev. RICHARD COOKE, M.A.—
Stephen Langton's Death . . . 566

W. CROOKE, M.A.— PAGE
The Camel and the Eye of the Needle . 283

Rev. WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK, B.D.—
An Outline of Assyrian Grammar . . 522

Very Rev. JOHN L. DARBY, D.D.—
Is there no Atonement? 224

Rev. M. B. DAVIDSON, M.A.—
Where were the Disciples? . . . 525

Professor T. WITTON DAVIES, M.R.A.S., Ph.D.—
Stones of Rolling 283

Professor JAMES DENNEY, D.D.—
The Word 'Hate' in Luke 14^{26} . . 41
Love 72

Professor S. R. DRIVER, D.D.—
The Ideals of the Prophets . . . 29
Maps of Palestine containing Ancient Sites 495, 562

Rev. P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D.—
The Faith of Jesus 8

Rev. D. R. FOTHERINGHAM, M.A.—
John 14^{1} 138

Rev. A. T. FRYER, M.A.—
The Corpse Candle 93

Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D.—
Present and Future Kingdom in the Gospels 535

Professor JOH. GEFFCKEN—
Character 426

Mrs. MARGARET D. GIBSON, D.D., LL.D.—
Seventy and Seven 44
John 11^{43} 328

Professor A. R. GORDON, M.A., D.Litt.—
The Story of Samson 523

J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.—
Clauda or Cauda? 17
Crete, the Jordan, and the Rhone . 303

Professor W. W. Holdsworth, M.A.— PAGE
The Life of Faith 189, 310

Professor Fritz Hommel, Ph.D.—
The Oldest Library in the World and the New Deluge Tablets . . . 368
The Traditions of the Masai . 390, 462

Rev. Morris Joseph—
The Place of Charity or Almsgiving in the O.T. 427

A. H. Keane, LL.D.—
The Stone Ages 42

Rev. John Kelman, M.A., D.D.—
The Pilgrim's Progress . . 57, 323, 421

Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, M.A., D.Sc., D.D.—
Harnack on the Recently Discovered Odes of Solomon 444

Rev. Arthur B. Kinsey, B.A., B.D.—
The Triumph-Joy 282

Edgar de Knevett—
The German Excavations at Jericho 353, 428

Professor L. Köhler, D.Phil.—
Luke 11^{41} 380

Rev. David M. W. Laird, M.A.—
In Necessariis Unitas 523

Stephen Langdon, M.A., Ph.D.—
The Name Abraham in Babylonian . 88

Professor Robert Law, B.D.—
1 John $3^{19.20}$ 42

Professor John E. McFadyen, M.A.—
The Centralization of Israel's Worship . 264

Professor H. R. Mackintosh, M.A., D.Phil., D.D.—
The Revival of Kenoticism . . . 105
The Theology of Bellarmine . . 216
Christologies Ancient and Modern 486, 553

Professor Robert Mackintosh, M.A., D.D.—
The Tone of Galatians 2^{1-10} . . . 327
Where were the Disciples? . . . 379

Rev. P. J. Maclagan, M.A., D.Phil.—
Taoism: Its Christian Affinities and its Defects 155, 201, 258

Rev. George R. Macphail, M.A.—
As the Hart Panteth 137
A Gaelic Gloss from Bobbio . . 280

Rev. G. Margoliouth, M.A.—
The Use of Charms and Amulets in Ethiopia 403

Rev. A. S. Martin, M.A., B.D.—
Why callest thou Me good? . . . 137

Professor L. Heyworth Mills, D.D.— PAGE
Identity in Creeds without Historical Connexion 134

Rev. James Moffatt, M.A., D.D.—
Jacquier's N.T. Introduction . . 44
2 Thessalonians $3^{14.15}$ 328
A Liturgy of Mithras 377

Late Professor W. R. Morfill—
The Russian Sects 217

Rev. James Hope Moulton, D.Lit., D.D.—
The Marks of Jesus 283

Professor Eb. Nestle, D.D.—
ἐπιούσιος in Hebrew and Aramaic . 43
Hebrews $3^{8.15}$ 94
Adam 139
The Sod Bible 329
The First Female Martyr . . . 329
Acts 27^{39} 380
The Index Biblicus of the Vulgate . 380
The Mistakes in the Revised N.T. . 380
The Coat without Seam . . . 521
The Aramaic Name of the Passover . 521
When did Stephen Langton die? . . 524
Chronology of the Old Testament . 567

Rev. F. W. S. O'Neill, M.A.—
The Foundation Sacrifice . . . 43

Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D.—
The Vital Energies of the Gospel . . 10

Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S.—
The Oldest Library in the World and the New Deluge Tablets . . . 364

Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A.—
Studies in Pauline Vocabulary 19, 112, 236

Rev. F. V. Pratt, M.A.—
Revelation 14^{13} 379

Professor Sir William M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., D.D.—
Religious Antiquities in Asia Minor . 64
The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist . 246, 295, 343, 473, 515

Rev. G. A. Johnston Ross, M.A.—
What is a Christian? 274

Rev. James B. Russell, M.A.—
Was the Baptist loyal to Jesus? . . 333

Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.—
The Latest Light from Oriental Archæology 45
What was the Scene of Abraham's Sacrifice? 86
Recent Oriental Archæology . . 471
Archæology of the Book of Genesis . 519

Rev. J. A. Selbie, M.A., D.D.— PAGE
Two Old Testament Commentaries . 501

Rev. J. M. Shaw, M.A.—
Visibility of our Lord's Resurrection Body 544

Rev. C. P. Sherman, M.A.—
A Reed shaken with the Wind . . 379

Professor Henry Preserved Smith, D.D.—
The Faith of Jesus 281

Rev. M. Linton Smith, M.A.—
James 2^8 329

Eugene Stock, D.C.L.—
Which Herod? 42
The Date of the First Gospel . . 523

Professor G. G. V. Stonehouse, M.A.—
A Note on Micah 1^{2b} 377

Professor J. G. Tasker, D.D.—
Theology and History 76
Dr. Paul Feine on the Apocalyptic Teaching of Jesus 454

Rev. A. Thom, M.A.— PAGE
Christ's Necessities 429

Rev. W. R. Thomson, B.D.—
The Aristocratic Element in Religion . 278

Rev. J. C. Todd, M.A., B.Sc.—
The Logia of the Baptist . . . 173

Rev. W. S. Walford, M.A.—
John 14^1 138

Rev. C. S. Ward, M.A.—
Stephen Langton's Death . . . 567

Rev. T. H. Weir, M.A., B.D.—
John 2^{19} 191
The Election of Saul 375
The Muhammadan 'Corner' . . 566

Rev. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D.—
Luke of Antioch in Pisidia . . . 164

Rev. Arthur Wright, D.D.—
Professor Stanton on the Synoptic Problem 211

Ven. G. R. Wynne, D.D.—
Mercy and Truth 405

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Abraham 86, 88
Adam 139
Adithaim 565
Adullam 564
Apocalyptic Teaching of Jesus 199, 437, 454
Archæology, Oriental . . 471
,, of Genesis . . 519
Ashnah 563
Asia Minor, Religious Antiquities 64
Atonement . . . 67, 224
Authority 278
Azekah 564
Babylonian Mythology . . 145
Baptist and Christ . . 333, 530
,, Logia of . . . 173
Bible, 'the Sod' . . . 329
Catholicism of First Gospel . 439
Centralization of Worship . . 264
Character 426
Charity in O.T. 427
Charms in Ethiopia . . . 403
Christ's Necessities . . . 429
,, Resurrection . . . 419
,, Resurrection Body . . 544
Christian, What is a? . . 274
Christianity 533
Christologies Ancient and Modern 486, 553
Chronology of O.T. . . . 567
Church in First Gospel . . 441
Clauda or Cauda? . . . 17
Coat without Seam . . 521, 567
Commentaries, Two O.T. . . 501
Commentary, Great Text 13, 61, 108, 158, 205, 253, 299, 347, 393, 466, 490, 538

PAGE
'Corner,' Muhammadan . . 566
Corpse Candle . . . 23, 93
Creeds, Identity without Historical Connexion . . . 134
Crete, the Jordan, and the Rhone 303
Cushan-rishathaim . . . 192
Degree 112
Deluge Tablets . . . 364, 504
Deuteronomy 45
Driver 286
Enam 564
En-gannim 564
Eschatology . . 199, 437, 454
Eshtaol 563
Ethiopian Charms . . . 403
Eucharist, Authorities for Institution . 246, 295, 343, 473, 515
Eucken's Philosophy . . . 244
Exposition, Notes of Recent 1, 49, 97, 145, 193, 241, 289, 337, 385, 433, 481, 529
Failure . . . 168, 219, 457
Faith 241, 389
,, Life of . . . 189, 310
,, of Jesus . . 8, 116, 281
Fear 423
Fig Tree, Barren . . 328, 387
Fourth Gospel, Aramaic Archetype 91
'Freely' 558
Gaelic Gloss from Bobbio . . 280
Gaianus 64
Gederah 565
Gederothaim 565
Genesis 294, 519
Gospel 497
,, Vital Energies of . . 10

PAGE
Gospels, Tendency . . . 530
Hate 41
Hittites 66, 481
Holy Spirit . . 49, 52, 310
Immanuel 2
In Necessariis Unitas . . . 523
Jacob 6
Jacob's Well 436
Jazer 495, 562
Jehovah 293, 355
Jericho, Excavations . . 353, 428
Jesus, Apocalyptic Teaching 199, 437, 454
,, Faith of . . 8, 116, 281
,, Marks of . . . 283
,, Omniscience . . . 197
,, and Law 337
,, or Christ 149
John, Gospel 91
Jordan 303
Kenoticism 105
Kingdom . . . 440, 454, 535
Langton, Stephen . 524, 566, 567
Last Supper, Day of . . . 246
Law, Christ's Attitude . . 337
Literature 22, 79, 122, 175, 225, 266, 312, 370, 407, 446, 508, 547
Logia of the Baptist . . . 173
Love 72
Luhith 495
Luke of Antioch in Pisidia . . 164
Marks of Jesus 283
Martyr, First Female . . . 329
Masai, Traditions . . 390, 462
Matthew, Catholicism and Date of Gospel . . . 439, 523

	PAGE
Meekness	341
Mercy	405
Mere	171
Moriah	86
Mozah	356
Oldest Library in the World	364, 504
Old Testament, Ethics	434
Palestine, Maps of	495, 562
Papal Infallibility	147
Passover	521
Pauline Vocabulary	19, 112, 236
Persian and Jewish Religion	134
Pilate's Wife	4
Pilgrim's Progress	57, 323, 421
Power	52
Present and Future Kingdom in the Gospels	535
Prophecy	1, 339
Prophets, Ideals of	29
Psychology of Religion	196, 530
Purification, Law of	34
Ransom	306
Religion, Aristocratic Element	278
Resurrection, Christ's	419
,, Body, Visibility	544
Revelation, Book of	120
Rhone	303
Sacrifice, Foundation	43, 139
Sakhra	88
Sanctification	50
Sanday	140
Saul, Election	376
Seal-cylinders	471
Seals, Book with Seven	120
Sermon, The American	356
Seventy and Seven	44
Shaaraim	564
Social Question	385
Socoh	564
'Sod' Bible	329
Solomon, Odes of	444
Stigmata	283
Suffering Servant	3
Synoptic Problem	117, 211
Taoism	155, 201, 258
Tappuah	564
Theology and History	76
Theology, Foreign	28, 216, 477, 525
Thought	172
Triumph	19, 282
Truth	405
Visibility of our Lord's Resurrection Body	544
'Worthily'	383, 522
Yarmuth	564
Zanoah	564
Zorah	563

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Adams, Israel's Ideal	277
Adeney, Christian Conception of God	276
,, N.T. Doctrine of Christ	129
Ainsworth, Pilgrim Church	276
Alden, Introduction to Poetry	80
Anderson, St. Matthew	231
Aristotelian Society, Proceedings IX.	86
Aristotle, De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus	318
Bacon, Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate	548
Bartoli, Primitive Church	129
Bevan, Birth and Growth of Toleration	229
Biblical Ideas of Atonement	314
,, Questions of the Day	145, 289
Blackmar, Elements of Sociology	26
Blaxland, Struggle with Puritanism	416
Bompas, Folklore of Santal Parganas	235
Boutroux, Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy	266
Brown, History of Scotland	126
Burton, Problem of Evil	418
Bussell, Marcus Aurelius	371
Butler, Gothic Architecture	513
Cambridge Biblical Essays	145, 289
Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Literature	175
Carus, Pleroma	321
,, Philosophy as a Science	322
Cary, Christianity in Japan	185
Chadwick, Social Relationships	268
Chapman, English Literature and Religion	550
Christ and Civilization	407
Clarke, Sixty Years with Bible	334
Companion Bible	231, 329
Conybeare, Ring of Pope Xystus	419
Crawley, Idea of the Soul	179
Cunliffe, Shakespearean Dictionary	448
Curtis, Chronicles	501
Dale, Religion	271
Davies, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther	233, 283
,, Systematic Theology	83
Dieterich, Eine Mithras-Liturgie	377
Dods, Christ and Man	180
,, Footsteps in the Path of Life	316
Dole, Ethics of Progress	187
Douglas, Philosophy of Pietro Pomponazzi	550
Downer, Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit	277
Drummond, Transmission of Text of N.T.	133
Durell, Self-Revelation of our Lord	508
Dykes, Divine Worker in Creation and Providence	123
Edghill, Faith and Fact	309
Everett, Theism and the Christian Faith	181
Fairbairn, Studies in Religion and Theology	239
Falconer, Unfinished Symphony	199
Farnell, Cults of the Greek States	267
Farquhar, Interpretation of Nature	549
Fawcett, Individual and Reality	233
Feine, Theologie des N.T.	454
Findlay, Life of Dr. Moulton	373
Fleming, Reformation in Scotland	370
Flemming, Ein Judisch-Chr. Psalmbuch	444
Forsyth, Cruciality of the Cross	84
,, Person and Place of Jesus Christ	320
Galloway, Principles of Religious Development	316
Gardner, Modernity and the Churches	241
Garstang, Land of the Hittites	547
Gladden, Recollections	267
Gollancz, Sermons and Addresses	315
Gordon, Quiet Talks on Home Ideals	144
Gore, Orders and Unity	234
Grass, Russischen Sekten	217
Green, The Ephesian Canonical Writings	515
Greenhough, Mind of Christ in St. Paul	268
Grenfell, Labrador	334
Groot, Religion of the Chinese	415
Gwatkin, Early Church History	79
Hackmann, Buddhism	235
Hall, Evolution and the Fall	374
Hamilton, Wonderful River	118
Hanauer, Folklore of the Holy Land	414
Hanson, Originality of the Gospel	482
Harden, Gospel in Hades	533
Harris, Odes and Psalms of Solomon	229
,, Early Christian Psalter	230
Harrowes, Minister and his Work	272
Hawes, Crete	319
Headlam, History, Authority, and Theology	272
Henslow, Vulgate the Source of False Doctrines	330, 380
Henson, Liberty of Prophesying	269
,, Westminster Sermons	412
Hilprecht, Earliest Version of Babylonian Deluge Story	365, 368, 472, 504
Hobhouse, Church and World in Idea and History	508
Hogg, Karma and Redemption	56
Holborn, Architectures of European Religions	47
Hort, St. James	181
Horton, Great Issues	187
Hughes, Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature	82
Inge, Faith	127
Jackson, Studies in the O.T.	82

PAGE

Jacquier, Hist. des Livres du N.T. 44
Jesus or Christ? 149
Johnston, Victorious Manhood . 170
Jones, Working Faith of the Social Reformer . . . 371
Jordan, Blaise Pascal . . . 187
,, Religion in Italian Universities . . . 81
Jowett, High Calling . . . 84
Joyce, Inspiration of Prophecy . 339
Kelman, Courts of the Temple . 270
Kent, Kings and Prophets of Israel and Judah . . . 84
King, Development of Religion . 410
,, Ethics of Jesus . . . 415
Knowlson, Origins of Popular Superstitions 510
Lake, Monasticism on Mount Athos 319
Latimer, Under Three Tsars . 26
Lawson, Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion 409
Leckie, Authority in Religion 124, 278
Lehmann, Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom . . 511
Leonard, Islam 130
Letters to Pope Pius X. . . 452
Lidgett, Sermons . . . 270
Lilley, Soul of St. Paul . . 200
Loch, Charity and Social Life . 511
Lodge, Survival of Man . . 182
Macauliffe, Sikh Religion . . 312
Mackintosh, Life on God's Plan 171
Maclaren, Expositions 128, 320, 414
Macleane, Lancelot Andrewes . 449
MacCaffrey, Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century . . 548
Mahaffy, What have the Greeks done for Modern Civilization? 184
Marchant, J. B. Paton . . 81
Marczali, Hungary in the 18th Century 447
Martin, Lettres néo-babyloniennes 471
Martinengo-Cesaresco, Animals in Human Thought . . 22
Mason, George Howard Wilkinson 70
Masterman, Studies in Galilee . 126
Mathew, Hildebrand . . . 372
Mathews, Gospel and Modern Man 511
Milligan, Greek Papyri . . 372
Moffatt, George Meredith . . 129
Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels 228, 292, 433
Morgan, Bible and the Cross . 268
Morison, Milton and Liberty . 179
Morrison, Return of the Angels 166
Moulton, Witness of Israel . 3
Mozley, Ritschlianism . . 307
Muir, Modern Substitutes for Christianity 268
Narsai, Liturgical Homilies . 125
Naville, Old Egyptian Faith . 418
Nietsche, Thus spake Zarathustra 123
,, Future of Our Educational Institutions . 123
,, Human, All too Human 123

PAGE

Nietsche, Will to Power . . 123
,, Genealogy of Morals . 450
Oesterley, Jewish Doctrine of Mediation 315
Orchard, Modern Theories of Sin 319
Orr, Revelation and Inspiration . 373
Ottley, Christian Ideas and Ideals 52
Peabody, Social Question . . 385
Peake, Introduction to N.T. . 127
,, Heroes and Martyrs of Faith 415
Pesch, Christian Philosophy of Life 80
Petrie, Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt 231
,, Growth of the Gospels . 551
Pick, Apocryphal Acts . . 183
Pinches, Assyrian Grammar . 522
Playfair, The Garos . . . 552
Plummer, St. Matthew . . 122
,, Church of England in 18th Century . . 321
Prášek, Gesch. der Meder u. Perser 472
Ragg, Church of the Apostles . 27
Ramsay, Revolution in Constantinople . . . 226
,, Thousand and One Churches . . . 225
Rankin, Life of Christ, Part II. . 515
Rapaport, Tales and Maxims from the Talmud 552
Rashdall, Philosophy and Religion 319
Rayner, Christian Community . 26
Recent Christian Progress . . 193
Religion and the Modern World 199
Rendall, Epistles to the Corinthians 130
Rhodes, Philosophy of Change . 234
Richard, Confessional History of Lutheran Church . . . 85
Richter, Protestant Missions in Near East 417
Robertson, Papal Conquest . 272
Robinson, Interpretation of Christ to Non-Christian Races . . 341
Ross, Original Religion of China 95
Russell, Sir Wilfrid Lawson . 186
Sampson, Progressive Redemption 243
Sanday, A New Marcion . . 99
Savage, Gospel of the Kingdom 370
Schaeder, Theologie und Geschichte 76
Schaff-Herzog . . 25, 226, 446
Schweitzer, Quest of the Historical Jesus 408
Sclater, Sons of Strength . . 100
Scott, Apocalypse . . . 131
Selbie, Aspects of Christ . . 411
Selby, Divine Craftsman . . 270
Servière, Théologie de Bellarmin 216
Shumaker, God and Man . . 410
Sieveking, Francis W. Newman 183

PAGE

Simon, Hebrew Genius . . 322
Simpson, Life of Rainy . . 70
,, Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility . 147, 183
Skinner, Genesis . . . 501
Smith, Religion in the Making . 450
,, Stone Ages . . . 42
Smyth, Modern Belief in Immortality 453
Snell, Handbook to Dante . . 178
Sowter, Trial and Triumph . 270
Speer, Christianity and the Nations 514
Sprott, Modern Study of O.T. . 24
St. Cyres, Pascal . . . 221
Stahn, Die Simson-Sage . . 523
Stalker, Ethic of Jesus . . 128
Stanton, Gospels as Historical Documents . . . 117, 211
Strachan, Captivity and Pastoral Epistles 512
Swete, Appearances of our Lord 419
,, Holy Spirit in N.T. . 49
Tait, Christ and the Nations . 374
Temple, Faith and Modern Thought 412
Theognis, Elegies . . . 509
Thomas, Dynamic of the Cross . 509
Thompson, Jesus according to St. Mark . . . 116
,, Saint Ignatius Loyola 223
,, Synoptic Gospels . 271
Thomson, Darwinism and Human Life 321
Toffteen, Historic Exodus . . 126
Trevelyan, Folklore of Wales . 23
Tyson, Indissolubility of Marriage 125
Underwood, Religions of Eastern Asia 451
Walker, Gospel of Reconciliation 67, 314
Ward, Seal-Cylinders of Western Asia 471
Warneck, Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums 10
Warren, Earliest Cosmologies . 128
Warschauer, Problems of Immanence 82
Watson, Scot of the 18th Century 180
Weir, Arabic Prose Composition 413
Weiss, Bearings of Darwinian Theory on Moral and Religious Progress . 115
,, Paul and Jesus . . 114
Wesley, Journal . . . 175
Westcott, Two Empires . . 130
Westphal, Law and the Prophets 293
Whyte, Thomas Shepard . . 132
Wickham, Hebrews . . . 451
Wilberforce, Power that Worketh in Us 186
Wilkinson, Heavenly Vision . 182
Williams, Galatians . . . 509
Wirgman, Life of James Green . 177
Wolf, Spinoza's Short Treatise on God 317
Wolferstan, Catholic Church in China 185
Young, Gospel of the Left Hand 218
Zahn, Introduction to N.T. . 22

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE
אֲפִיקֵי־מַיִם	137
אֶבֶן גְּלָל	283
אַבְרָהָם	90
הֵיכָל	191, 281
מצה	356
עָרַג	137
פֶּסַח	521
רֹעֵה צֹאן	519
שָׁעָה	520

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀπέρχομαι	310
βαθμός	112
βαπτίζω	38
δύναμις	377
ἐλέγχειν	310
ἐντος ὑμῶν	386
ἐπιούσιος	43
θριαμβεύω	19, 282
καταλλαγή	67
κοινωνία δαιμονίων	295
κοσμικός	451
ναός	191
παραπικρασμός	94
πορεύομαι	310
ῥαντίζω	38
στίγματα	283
ὑπάγω	310
φιλοτιμέομαι	52
χαρακτήρ	426

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gn iv. 1, 2, 3, 4	519
iv. 7, 8, 9	520
iv. 10	521
iv. 24	44
xiv. 18	87
xxii. 2	86
xxii. 14	87
Jos vi. 26	43
xxiv. 22	378
Jg iii. 7–11	192
1 S ix. 1–x. 16	376
ix. 7	138
x. 17–27	376
xii. 5	378
xxx. 6	218
2 Ch iii. 1	86
Ezr v. 8	283
v. 12	192, 281
Ps i. 3	538
xviii. 36	280
xlii. 1	137
xcv. 8	94
cxxxix. 9–10	382
Pr xxv. 1	46
Is i. 18	435
vii. 14	2
xxvi. 19	192, 281
xxix. 1, 2	87
xxxv. 1	29
xlix. 16	382
Ezk xxx. 2	34
xliii. 15	87
Hos xiv. 4	559
Mic i. 2	377
Mt iii. 7	382
v. 5	341
Mt v. 17–26, 38–48	337
vii. 7	377
viii. 11, 12	442
x. 8	561
xi. 7	379
xi. 12	101
xv. 1–20	35
xviii. 22	44
xix. 24	283
xx. 28	306
xxi. 43	442
xxii. 14	168
xxiii. 25, 26	36
xxvi. 26–29	248
xxvii. 19	4
xxviii. 19	443
Mk vi. 25	380
vii. 1–23	34
x. 17–27	484
x. 18	137
x. 31	457
xi. 12–14	328, 387
xiv. 5	275
xiv. 22–25	248, 344 f.
Lk ii. 44	166
x. 33	293
xi. 37–54	35
xi. 41	292, 380
xiv. 26	41
xv. 2	219
xv. 4	382
xv. 26	380
xvii. 21	386
xxii. 7–13, 14	343
xxii. 15, 16	344
xxii. 16, 18	473
Lk xxii. 17, 18	248, 344
xxii. 19, 20	248, 345, 474
xxii. 32	147
xxiii. 34	292
Jn i. 5, 11	93
i. 15, 29	92
i. 51	377
ii. 19	191, 281
iv. 4	429
v.–x.	379, 525
v. 46	92
vi. 32–64	517
viii. 56	91
x. 16	533
xi. 43	328
xii. 32–36	333
xiv. 1	53, 68, 138
xiv. 14	377
xv. 11–27	189
xvi. 1–15	310
xix. 23	521, 567
xx. 15	167
Ac xiv. 21, 22	164
xvi. 27	167
xxi. 39	525
xxvii. 16	17
xxvii. 39	380
Ro i. 16	52, 500
iii. 24	559
viii. 32	560
xv. 9	405
xv. 20	52
1 Co vii. 8	478
x. 16–21	295
xi. 20–30	296
xi. 23–26	248
1 Co xii. 28, 29	377
xiii. 1–3	72
2 Co ii. 14	19, 282
iii. 12	236
iii. 17	90
v. 9	52
Gal ii. 1–10	327
v. 7	50
vi. 17	283
Eph ii. 17	405
Col ii. 15	21
1 Th iv. 11	52
v. 23	49
2 Th iii. 14, 15	328
1 Ti iii. 13	112
He ii. 9	201
ii. 11	499
iii. 8, 15	94
xi. 16	498
xii. 2	281
Ja ii. 8	329
1 Jn ii. 28	500
iii. 19, 20	42
Rev i. 1	377
iii. 20	13
vii. 9, 10	61
vii. 14	108
xiv. 13	158, 380
xx. 12	205
xxi. 1	253, 255
xxi. 5	299
xxi. 6	560
xxi. 27	347
xxii. 3, 4	393
xxii. 14	466
xxii. 17	490

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE hope of the unbeliever in miracle is Prophecy. There was a time when Prophecy was looked upon as the most undoubtedly miraculous of all the miracles in the Bible. For there is nothing that appeals to men more forcibly than the foretelling of the future. But Prophecy is not miraculous now. The fore-teller has become a forth-teller. Give us time, says the unbeliever in miracle, and we shall drive the miracles altogether out of the Bible.

That a change has come over our conception of Prophecy is true. There may be an 'Argument from Prophecy' still, but it is certainly not the argument that it used to be. Whether it means that Prophecy is henceforth to be regarded as a natural occurrence we shall consider in a moment. But even if that is so, it does not follow that miracles are about to be swept out of the Bible. There is a good reason for the change that has come over our conception of Prophecy. And there is a good reason why that change should leave our belief in miracles unaffected.

Whatever happens to Prophecy our belief in miracles will remain, because our Lord Jesus Christ is a miracle. We cannot get rid of the miracles of the Bible without getting rid of Him. It is some years since Professor Huxley seized upon the miracle of the sending of the demons into the swine, and nicknamed it 'the Gadarene pig affair,' in the hope of discrediting all the miracles that the Gospels contain. There is something to be said even for 'the Gadarene pig affair,' and we may have occasion to refer to it also in a little. But Professor Huxley should have been held to it then, and we must hold all his successors to it now, that the miracle of the Gospels is the Lord Jesus Christ, and that we cannot get rid of miracle from the Bible without first getting rid of Him.

The change that has come over our conception of Prophecy is easily accounted for. It is due to the fact that in the study of Prophecy, attention has been called to the circumstances of the prophet's own time.

It was the great, and it became the glaring, blunder of our fathers that they separated the prophet from his own people and his own time. They understood that he spoke for the future,—not for his own generation, but for generations that were long afterwards to be born. They seemed to think that that was what the Apostle meant when he said that these things were written for our admonition.

And not only did they think that he spoke *for* the future; they thought also that he spoke *about*

the future. They remembered that he was sometimes called a seer, and they seemed to think of a seer as one who had second-sight. They knew that the prophet was in some sense sent by God to those who were within reach of his living voice. But that was little more than an accommodation. He really spoke, they said, to those who came after, and he spoke of the Messianic age, seeing it afar off and foretelling it.

When the historical method was applied to Prophecy, it came to be believed that all this was a mistake. For it was evident that the prophet was sent to the men of his own day, and that in many instances the message which he carried was applicable to them alone. Whereupon was struck the telling phrase, 'not a fore-teller, but a forth-teller.' And it was generally denied that the Hebrew prophet ever spoke either for the future or about it. There is a memorable passage in a book by Professor Driver, in which he asserts his belief in a case of actual prediction on the part of the prophet Isaiah. The passage is characteristic of one of the most courageous scholars of our time. But its very existence makes clear and emphatic the difference which the historical method has made.

Now, it would be unrighteous of us to seek to undo what the historical study of Prophecy has done. And it would be vain. But it would be untrue to say that we are satisfied with it. If the prophet spoke only for his own time, why do we call him a prophet? Was he not, on the lowest estimate of him, simply a statesman? Was he not, on the highest estimate, simply a preacher? But there is a greater difficulty than that.

Is it possible for a man, call him what you will, to speak to his own time only? He is the forth-teller for God, you say. Well, God is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And His purpose is the same. Is it possible for a prophet to cut off just so much of God's purpose as suits his own generation, in the same way as a tailor cuts off a 'length' from the web in order to make one particular garment? If we can no longer believe that the Hebrew seer overlooked the present, can we believe that he did not look into the future? 'Your father Abraham,' said Jesus to the Jews, 'rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad.' If Abraham saw it, so did Isaiah and all the prophets. The student of Prophecy may once have made the mistake of thinking that Isaiah did not speak for his own day and generation. We should make a much greater mistake if we were persuaded that he spoke only for his own day and generation. We shall never again forget that the Sign of Immanuel was a sign to Ahaz, king of Judah, or that the Suffering Servant was sent as a comforter to those who returned from the Captivity. But we should miss the grander purpose of Prophecy if we were to say that the Sign of Immanuel had nothing to do with the birth of Christ, and that the Suffering Servant had nothing to do with His death.

There is an article on the Sign of Immanuel in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July. The author is Dr. C. F. Burney, Fellow of St. John Baptist College, Oxford. Dr. Burney is dissatisfied with the current interpretation of the Sign of Immanuel. He does not himself connect it with the birth of Christ, but he leaves the way open for the connexion. He does call it a miracle.

Dr. Burney calls the Sign of Immanuel a miracle because he believes that it was the prediction of a virgin birth. Our fathers always understood that it was the prediction of a virgin birth. But when it was seen that the word which Isaiah uses for virgin does not necessarily mean a virgin, but only a girl of marriageable age, and that there is another word which means virgin, and only virgin, which he might have used but does not, the idea was dropped that he meant to speak of a virgin birth. And with the idea of the virgin birth went the idea that his prophecy was a prediction. Dr. Burney was trained in the

historical method. We understand that once he disbelieved in the virgin birth and the prediction. Further use of the historical method has restored his belief in both.

There is no doubt that Isaiah might have used a word which only signifies virgin. There is no doubt that the word which he uses, although it may mean virgin, and indeed is used in that sense in the Old Testament, possibly in every case of its occurrence, is nevertheless a more general word, and denotes any young woman who is come to marriageable years. But why should Isaiah use the narrower word? Let us suppose that a Messianic birth was looked for in the days of Isaiah. And let us suppose that it was to be a virgin birth. Dr. Burney gives good reasons for both suppositions. Then it was needless for Isaiah to say virgin. It would have been bad style. And we know the master of the Hebrew language that Isaiah was. All that he had to say was 'the girl,' 'the expected one.' And this is just what he does say. For we must not fail to notice that he uses the definite article before the word 'girl.' A virgin birth was *in the air*, as Dr. Burney puts it. The sign to Ahaz lay in fixing the time and circumstances of it.

The Suffering Servant is dealt with this month also, and again by a man of ripe scholarship who has been trained in the historical method of study. The Fernley Lecture for 1909 was delivered by the Rev. Wilfrid J. Moulton, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature in Headingley College, Leeds. It consists of a survey of God's dealings with His ancient people of Israel, and is now published under the title of *The Witness of Israel* (Culley; 3s. 6d.). About the middle of the volume Mr. Moulton offers us a fresh interpretation of the meaning of the Servant of the Lord.

Dr. Burney did not connect the virgin birth of Immanuel with the virgin birth of Christ. But he left the way open. Professor Moulton does not connect the Servant of the Lord with the agony in the Garden and the death on Calvary. But he also leaves the way open, and he makes the connexion inevitable. Who is the Suffering Servant of the Lord?

Professor Moulton runs over the recent interpretations. It is not the nation of Israel suffering innocently for the other nations of the earth, as Dr. Peake believes. It is not the ideal Israel, approximately realized in the loyal section of the nation, suffering many things for their faithfulness, with a suffering that is somehow redemptive, as Dr. Skinner so admirably argues. It is a person, as Duhm declares. Not Jehoiachin, however, as Sellin attempts to show; nor some mythological god dying and reviving, and celebrated in some Babylonian hymn which the Israelites may have heard in the Captivity, as Gressmann temptingly urges. Who is the Servant?

It is the Messiah-King of whom earlier prophets spoke. Professor Moulton does not say that this was present to the prophet's consciousness at the beginning. But he says that when the description of the Servant's death and glory is complete, the prophet returns to knit his own hopes with those which had gone before. He remembers the words of the ninth chapter of Isaiah, 'unto us a Child is born.' The Servant who has been exalted to be a King is this Child who is to sit upon the throne of his father David.

'Every man has the gift of imagination, and every one who cultivates it will find how serviceable it is. To listen to a sermon that shows not a particle of imaginative power, is like walking along the dry and dusty highway that traverses a featureless country. But to listen to a discourse which in all other respects is excellent, and has been illuminated by the play of well-trained imaginative power, is like walking across Ilkley moors in the early autumn, when the turf springs under your feet, and an Italian sky is overhead,

the air is exhilarating, and the rich and varied landscape exhibits new scenes of beauty at every advancing step you take. If you wish to hold your hearers bound by a spell which they cannot resist, in order that you may sway them towards the highest purposes at which man can aim, then cultivate the imagination.'

These sentences are quoted from the Rev. B. Hellier, in a volume entitled *The Art of Illustration Illustrated* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net), of which the author is the Rev. John Edwards. The immediate object of the quotation is to encourage the use of illustrations in the pulpit. For Mr. Edwards rightly judges that the choice of an illustration, and not its manufacture only, is a work of the imagination. But the quotation raises another question.

How far is a preacher entitled to use his imagination in the exposition of a text of Scripture? In the new volume of the *Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.) there is a sermon by the Rev. James Burns on 'Pilate's Wife.' The subject is a tempting one. The sermon is an excellent illustration of our meaning.

The text is Mt 27^{19}—'And while he was sitting on the judgement-seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.' The temptation, we say, or the call, whichever it is, freely to use the imagination in the treatment of that text, is very great. Mr. Burns uses it freely. Let us exercise our own freedom also in following him.

'All that we know of Pilate's wife,' says Mr. Burns, 'is found in this one text.' He means all that we know from Scripture. From other sources we learn some little things about her, one of them being her name of Claudia Procula. These things may not be reliable. They may be due to the that very use of the imagination which Mr. Burns enjoys. But Mr. Burns cannot refuse them on that account. And he does not refuse them. As his sermon proceeds he accepts the legends about the later life of Claudia as unhesitatingly as he himself invents the circumstances of her earlier life.

Pilate's wife 'appears but once in Scripture. It is at a moment when the suspense which surrounds the trial of our Lord is at its height, when the life of Christ seems hanging in the balance, when the mind and heart are enthralled with the awful issues that are at stake, and when every nerve throbs with a pained excitement. Her appearance relieves for a moment the almost unbearable strain; her message, with its pathetic warning and loving appeal, diverts the thoughts away from the Central Figure, and gives opportunity for self-recovery.' In that way does Mr. Burns prepare the stage for the introduction of the central figure. Her introduction suggests to the imagination three separate pictures—her home, her cross, and her act of daring.

Her home at this time was in Jerusalem. How was it there? Her husband was there because his work was there. But Augustus had passed a law forbidding provincial governors to take their wives with them. It is true that Tiberius had relaxed the rule. If a wife was anxious to go, and if her husband was ready to offer special security for her non-interference in affairs of State, then husband and wife were allowed to go together.

Yet Claudia knew what it meant to go with her husband to Jerusalem. She was far from being insensible to the attractions of Rome. Moreover, Palestine was distant, and Jerusalem was dull. Or if at any time Jerusalem should awaken out of its dulness, it was only to bring Pilate and his wife into a danger that was more to be dreaded than the deadliest dulness. For the Jews were difficult to manage. And for a nation that was really so advanced in some ways they were surprisingly indifferent to the shedding of blood. Pilate's wife

knew what she did in pleading to go to Jerusalem. But love casts out fear. Pilate also knew what he did in taking her with him. But Pilate loved his wife.

And so they made their home in Jerusalem. And Jerusalem became their home for ten anxious momentous years. 'This noble woman,' says Mr. Burns, 'fulfilled in highest measure the task of womanhood. She was her husband's better self: the guardian angel which presided over his honour. I think that I can see her welcoming him back to his home after some specially trying day, when his pride had been severely strained, and his patience utterly broken by the turbulent mob he was called upon to govern—welcoming him with gracious smile and loving word, seeking to lead his mind away from the irritating incident through which he had passed, and to guide his thoughts into a smoother channel; and I think, too, that I can hear her speak from her womanly heart words of pity and compassion, for those for whom her scornful husband had only bitterness and contempt.'

But Claudia Procula had her cross to carry. Her home was not a happy one. Pilate's love for his wife, and his wife's love for him, were not sufficient to save him from spiritual ruin. She was a good woman; he was a bad man. Long before Pilate saw Christ he began a course of life which sapped his sense of right and wrong. When in the providence of God Jesus stood before his judgment-seat, Pilate was already a slave to his own guilty past.

The cross which Pilate's wife had to carry was a heavy one. She had to live with a man whom she loved but could no longer respect. She had to stand at his side and see him sink lower and lower in his own estimation and in hers. The man whom once she had loved as the soul of every virtue had become shifty, unscrupulous, dishonourable. She loved him still, but now her love burned in upon her soul, and scorched her night and day. 'There are many things which darken human lives, many unspeakable tragedies in this strange world of ours; but tell me is there anything more tragic than this—for a woman to be bound by the indissoluble bonds of marriage to a man who is unworthy of her?'

What Pilate wanted was that foundation upon which character is built. He had no faith in God or man. 'What is truth? said jesting Pilate'; and possibly it was a jest, as Bacon calls it. For the outward signs of conduct—firmness in little things to the length of obstinacy, weakness in great to the length of contempt—these were but the outer signs of an inward emptiness. His wife loved him still, but she could not help him. As she waited for him the days grew longer. Her mind was occupied more with memory than with hope. And even the memory was bitter. For a sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things. She knew much and dreaded more. She dreaded by day and dreamed by night. She felt that something was coming. And it came at last. And when it came it was more terrible than in the darkness of her darkest fears she had anticipated.

Then Pilate's wife did her great act of daring. How she came to know Christ we cannot tell. Tradition says that she was already a proselyte of the gate. But in the tradition there is possibly religious pride, which is certainly not a legitimate use of the imagination. Nor is the tradition necessary. She had already been four years in Jerusalem. These years covered the whole period of Christ's public ministry. How could she fail to hear of Him? A few mornings ago there had occurred an incident, of every detail of which Pilate would be sure to obtain accurate information. It was the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. It seemed certain that some day her husband and He would meet face to face. The meeting was no longer to be hoped for, only to be feared. As she awoke, startled, in the yet early morning, she knew that her dream was more than a dream, and she sent her message.

It was undoubtedly a daring thing to do. For she knew that she had been allowed to accompany her husband on condition that she should not interfere with affairs of State. But there is a call that comes sometimes to a man or a woman which is higher than the call of duty. Sometimes we have to dare not to do our duty in order that our duty may be done. Claudia Procula was not the woman to forget the vow that she had made. But even if the breaking of her vow should mean degradation to her husband, even if it should mean death to herself, hearing a call from a higher world than the world of Roman politics, she sent her message, 'Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.'

Pilate was greatly moved. His first flash of angry amazement gave place to the amazement of love. He knew what it had cost her to send that message. And now, for a moment, the history of the world, as it were, waited upon a woman's dream. Will the prayer of Pilate's wife prevail?

It would have prevailed once. But not now. Now it has influence enough with Pilate only to send him to wash his hands superstitiously. For he has his own past to reckon with. As the soldiers led Jesus away to be crucified, Pilate entered his home. His wife was waiting, and their eyes met.

What is it that gives the story of Jacob its peculiar interest? Is it the way in which it is told? It is certainly well told. The selection of incident, the development of character, the surprise of felicitous phrase, all acknowledge some master in the art of story-telling. But that is not what gives it its interest.

Is it the contrast between Jacob and Esau? That contrast is very striking. And it is more than a difference between two men. It is more than a difference between two types of men. Far back beyond the birth of Jacob and Esau we discover some purpose of God which baffles our understanding and which we hope to find unravelled in the history of their lives. It is the purpose we denominate Election. Yet it is not the mystery of 'Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated' that gives this story its peculiar interest.

Its interest comes from this, that the life of Jacob is the life of the religious man. There is such a thing as religion. It is found in the Bible; it is found in all human life. And it is always the dominant interest. In the life of Jacob we see its influence manifesting itself more individually, and yet more typically, than in any other human life we have record of. Jacob the natural man is a poor creature, cunning and crawling. Jacob becomes a power with God, an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile.

There are four periods in his life. The first is at Beersheba. Here Jacob is himself his only concern. He is religious, which Esau is not. He knows the value of the Birthright. He appreciates the possibilities of the Blessing. But his religion is a family religion. It is personal only in so far that he identifies himself with his family, is acquainted with its religious history, and shares its religious promise. His religion does not diminish his selfishness, but accentuates it, giving it occasion, and almost excuse, for its exercise. If Jacob had been as profane as Esau, he would not have waylaid his brother in order to obtain the Birthright, he would not have circumvented his father in order to snatch the Blessing.

The next period is at Bethel. Jacob is now alone. He has left the family behind him, and the family religion. Family religion is a great blessing. The boy is sometimes a sneak, oftener a prig, who finds pride in it. But he has a future before him. The testing time comes when he leaves the family behind. Jacob has left the family behind, but not the God of the family. The

God of his family had been the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac; He is now the God of Jacob. It came as a surprise. He dreamed and he awoke. 'Surely God is in this place, and I knew it not.' But we dream our own dreams. Esau would not have seen the angels or felt the awfulness of the place.

It came as a surprise, because God had been associated with Beersheba and the family resident there. Faring forth towards Paddan-aram that day, he had left behind him all that made life great, all that he had planned and won, the Birthright and the Blessing, the family pride and the family promise. And his surprise is to find that he has not left behind the family God. God is in this place, in this place where the family is not, in this place where Jacob himself is alone. That is the surprise.

So he makes a bargain with Him. On the side of Jacob well-doing, on the side of God prosperity —that is the bargain. And it lifts Jacob a little out of his selfishness. For selfishness is sin, and the greater the sin the greater the selfishness. The man who makes a bargain with God at the threshold of independent life—so much well-doing, so much prosperity—is a selfish man still. But well-doing is the young man's heaven. And it saves him from the future of remorse, the old man's hell. And then, a bargain though it be, and a selfish one, it is Jacob's assurance that God goes with him to Paddan-aram.

The third period is at Paddan-aram. Here Jacob discovers that God is not content to be a partner in a prosperous business. Laban prospers also. What is more significant, Laban prospers through Jacob's own prosperity, and that is through the presence of Jacob's God. Now Laban never made a bargain with God as Jacob did. Why then should he be prosperous? It is evident that this partnership with God is not to be the simple matter of so much prosperity for so much well-doing which Jacob expected it to be.

It is significant also, though perhaps not more significant to Jacob, that all his well-doing does not bring him unclouded prosperity. He has to wait for Rachel. It is a long service and galling, though the presence of Rachel softens it. Then Leah is substituted. The trick is worthy of Jacob himself, which makes it none the pleasanter. He has been duped in his dearest desire. And the years must go on again, long service with drudgery, and the hope less confident than before. Jacob cannot say that God has not kept to the bargain, for he has succeeded in business beyond expectation. But it is not the simple engagement that he expected it to be.

And now how easy it would be for Jacob to repudiate God. Men have rejected Him for less, and have cried out that it is vain to serve God, and what profit is it to have kept His commandments? But Jacob does not reject Him. What he repudiates is his own selfishness. Slowly and painfully he discovers that God signs a deed of partnership not to be the partner of a man of business, but to be the partner of a man. For why should He spend His time planning the prosperity of a trading enterprise? The cattle on a thousand hills are His. The only acquisition He has to plan for, and to wait for, is the acquisition of a human soul. As Jacob loses faith in himself, beaten partly by Laban's check-mate but more by God's chastisement, we begin to have faith in him.

The fourth period is at the brook Jabbok. At last it is self or God. There is to be no more compromise. As the crisis approaches Jacob excels himself as a strategist. He seems determined to earn our supreme contempt for cowardice and for cringing. 'When Esau my brother meeteth thee, and asketh thee, saying, Whose art thou? and whither goest thou? and whose are these before thee? then thou shalt say, They be thy servant Jacob's; it is a present sent unto my lord Esau; and, behold, he also is behind us.'

But the Jacob who disposes his following so adroitly, and whose mouth is so ready with 'my lord Esau' and 'thy servant Jacob,' is the same who has prayed a prayer by the brook Jabbok. Then Esau came and fell upon his neck and kissed him. And Jacob was not astonished. It was not 'my lord Esau' that softened his brother, nor the present. It was that prayer, preparing Jacob for the wrestling, the last struggle of selfishness with the will of God. Why should Esau be angry now? Jacob is a man, and God no longer needs an instrument of chastening.

Theodore Monod does not seem to have had the history of Jacob in mind when he wrote his hymn in four stanzas. He seems to have had in mind his own history, the history of the religious man. But how well it fits the history of Jacob.

O the bitter shame and sorrow,
That a time could ever be
When I let the Saviour's pity
Plead in vain, and proudly answered,
'All of self, and none of Thee!'

Yet He found me; I beheld Him
Bleeding on the accursèd tree,
Heard Him pray, 'Forgive them, Father!'
And my wistful heart said faintly,
'Some of self, and some of Thee!'

Day by day His tender mercy,
Healing, helping, full and free,
Sweet and strong, and, ah! so patient,
Brought me lower, while I whispered,
'Less of self, and more of Thee!'

Higher than the highest heaven,
Deeper than the deepest sea,
Lord, Thy love at last hath conquered;
Grant me now my supplication,
'None of self, and all of Thee!'

The Faith of Jesus.

By Principal the Rev. P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D., Hackney College, London.

This is a matter that I have often wished to see discussed more fully than has so far come under my notice. A year or two ago I remember searching such writers as I could reach who might be expected to handle the point, but without success. My greatest disappointment was my failure to find any allusion to it even in a book so thorough and so fertile as Schlatter's *Der Glaube*. And yet it lies very near the centre of things for us. If faith be the central exercise of religion, and Jesus be its central figure, a discussion seems imperative of the relation between faith in our case and whatever takes its place in the case of Jesus as His relation to God. At the present moment, when the nature of Christ's person is again in the forefront of Christian concern, and when the burning question is whether the religious problem was for Him just what it is for us,—at such a time it is singular that it should be so hard to find my theme discussed by first-rate authorities. At the same time my reading is so far short of the encyclopædic range of a Sanday or a Moffatt that I speak with great misgiving.

I have, however, come upon one reference to the subject which seems to me suggestive, and which has set me on the writing of these lines. It is in Schlatter's new volume of *New Testament Theology*, p. 316.[1]

Christ's love to the Father is a love of infinite *trust*—not to be mastered or lost even in death. And by death, of course, is not meant death in the egoist sense of individual arrest with its terror and gloom, but such death as alone could

[1] I remark in passing how I am struck with the moral and historic insight of this book in contrast with the intellectual acumen and fertility of combination of Holtzmann. It is all the difference between sympathetic interpretation and analytic construction. The one seems written from within, the other from without; the one with radiance, the other with brilliance; the one so steadying, the other so illuminating; the one so grave, the other so keen; the one so full of grace, the other of truth.

make an agony for one like Jesus—the death of all His hope and passion for the Kingdom of God through its one organ on earth—Israel. It was His agony for Israel in its great refusal of the Kingdom in Himself—that Israel, who seemed God's Viceroy, should foil and murder even God's Son. Christ's love of His people came into violent collision with His love of God. And His victory was this, that the trust He lost in Israel (and therefore in history), He never lost in God, even when everything seemed to fall to pieces that had hitherto promised to secure the glory and sovereignty of His holiness among men. When every human, historic, and rational ground for trust had gone, His trust in God and His victory and reign still held. He could trust God even when He ceased to be able to trust His experience of God and every historic sign of God. He knew that His life and all it stood for was secured by God even in the hour of collapse and death. Nothing could prevent God's reign—not the death of His Son at the hands of His people. If that death did no more it would at least do the terrible service of precipitating the judgment without which now the Kingship of God could not be.

Yet for all His trust in God, we hear nothing of the *faith* of Jesus. The N.T. writers seem almost deliberately to avoid applying to His relation with God the distinctive word which expresses ours both to God and Him. He required from men a faith He never exercised. He sees God, knows God, hears Him, and so forth, but He never *believes* in God as He taught and enabled men to do. He never says, 'Believe in me as I believe in the Father.' The religion of Jesus was a very different thing, for the N.T. writers, from the best of ours. Faith is the creation of God in us, but the trust of Jesus is never spoken or thought of in that way.

And Schlatter's suggestion seems sound. In our faith we have to make our way over a kind of moral difficulty which for Jesus did not exist. We have a gulf to cross that He had not. His darkness had a different source from ours. The experience of God in His case rested on a spiritual continuity with Him which for us does not exist—whether by our nature or by our fault. For Him neither did thought create the difficulty nor will the distance that we find between us and God. He felt otherwise than we before the Holiness which He yet saw as we never can. He never quailed before that which humbles us to the dust. Not such was His humility. For us there is now no condemnation, because for Him there never was. From Him the confession of sin and of faith are alike absent. Where we believe, He knew. Ours is the confidence of faith, His of vision. Where we believe with effort and godly fear, He knew and rejoiced in spirit (Mt 11^{25-27}). For us faith is much more dependent on fear than with Him. With us it dies as it casts out fear; for Him the Lordship of the Father had another effect, and He was at home with His holy majesty. There was no repentance in His faith; but ours is not faith without it. Revelation was one process for Him, it is another for us. He needed none of the grace which is its one form for us. Our love of God grows out of faith, His trust grew out of love. We find God *in* our experience, but God *was* His. For us God emerges in our self-consciousness, for Him God was His self-consciousness. There was nothing mediatorial in His religion, ours is essentially so. He was His own Christ—as some now hold Humanity to be.

So that, as Schlatter says, faith is associated with such visitations of God as reach men from without—even if they come with that inward outwardness which they have in coming through Christ the Spirit. Christ used the word for the attitude of those who sought God's help through Him; but it was an attitude which He occupied towards none, towards no phase of nature and no soul of man.

It is little we are given to know of the religion of Jesus as His personal experience. But we know enough to know how essentially different it is from ours. And when one hears, for instance, that a particular community has been congratulated as being so Christian because of the ardency of its imitation of Christ, without any reference to its faith in a Redeemer whom to imitate is to deny—one wonders if all the Churches of the Reformation are due to end thus, and, having received the Spirit by the hearing of faith, are to sink to the perfection of the works of a subtle law. The faith *of* Christ is beyond us, and anything in its nature can only come by faith *in* Christ.

The Vital Energies of the Gospel.

By the Rev. W. P. Paterson, M.A., D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

Joh. Warneck has enriched the multifarious literature of Foreign Missions by a contribution of genuine scientific value.[1] His theme is of profound interest, both theoretical and practical; and his conclusions are based on a mass of carefully tested facts. His object is, not to prove that Christianity is overpowering heathenism—that can be taken for granted,—but to explain its success. In other words, he tries to define the elements of the gospel which make it a penetrating and prevailing force. The gain which he promises from the inquiry is that it will assist the missionary to concentrate upon those aspects of the Christian message which have a convincing and converting energy, while it may also enable the home-churches to view the doctrinal and ethical content of Christianity in a juster perspective. It may be added that he compels the apologist to reconsider the benevolent and optimistic views now popular as to the relation of other faiths to Christianity.

The first division of the book gives an account of the nature and effects of the animistic type of heathenism. In narrowing the investigation to the field of Animism, Warneck is able to draw on his own missionary experience in Sumatra, while there is the further advantage that flourishing native churches have arisen within its sphere of influence in many parts of the world. He confirms the report that animistic tribes have usually a belief in higher gods, and even in a supreme deity who is the Creator and Preserver of the world; but this belief is shown to be quite inoperative—the powers which seriously engage the attention of the worshippers being the spirits of the departed, and other spirits of a somewhat base and malignant sort. The second characteristic tenet is a doctrine of the soul which is shown to be more complicated and subtle than it appears in some popular expositions. There is a self; and in addition there is a soul which, while its presence is essential to life, is very loosely and unreliably related to the self. This soul requires to be carefully conciliated by gifts and other attentions, feels no keen interest in preserving the human life to which it is linked, and promptly deserts the body when it has reason to be offended. Many deep-rooted customs have their explanation in this peculiar psychology of the savage.

The illuminating exposition of the animistic creed is followed by a gloomy picture of the spiritual condition of the animistic world. The salient features are summed up under the following heads. The heathen lives in a state of utter uncertainty about divine things. He has no personal assurance in regard to the great problems of life, and when pressed can only say that thus his fathers believed, and such are the customs which were handed down. He lives under a system of lies, and while half-suspecting them to be lies, he is content to be deceived. He has no communion with the living God, but wastes his religious instincts on fictions of his imagination, or possibly on actual diabolic powers. He lives in a state of constant terror because of the caprice and malignity of the spirit-world, and through fear of them he is all his days subject to bondage. On the practical side the genius of the system is a selfishness which takes compensation for its dread of the spirits in cruelty towards man. It is essentially immoral. Custom takes the place of morality, and custom allows, and on occasion fosters, the most licentious practices. Finally, the goods which the heathen covets are purely worldly and materialistic. Warneck admits that some will think that he paints the picture too black. But he insists that these are the facts, and that they are the direct product of heathenism. Its powers are of the earth earthy, and they can only drag men down into ever deeper moral degradation.

What now is the attitude of this type of heathen mind on making acquaintance with Christianity? In the first instance it is strongly hostile, and for these reasons. Savage religion is a tribal affair, and the individual does not allow himself to think independently on the subject. Moreover, Christianity approaches him as the religion of a foreign race. Yet again, his materialistic bent of mind leads him to despise, even if he could understand, the spiritual blessings which it offers. Still

[1] Joh. Warneck, *Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums*[2]. Berlin, 1908.

more is he repelled by the demands of the Christian moral code. It condemns institutions and customs which he finds profitable or enjoyable, and even when it touches his conscience it can hardly move him from his fatalistic lethargy.

On the other hand, a number of factors conspire to break down the initial antagonism. For one thing the misery which heathenism fails to relieve, which it rather aggravates, suggests that there may be a remedy in a new message. The missionary acquires respect as the representative of a race and a civilization which are manifestly of a higher order. Confidence is further inspired by the moral qualities of the missionary—his veracity and his unselfish devotion. The colonial administration of a Christian power, moreover, by maintaining peace and order, creates the conditions which are favourable to missionary activity. It has also often been observed that a great effect has been produced by a providential leading, which may take the form of an ancient prophecy touching the appearance in later days of heaven-sent messengers, or which may work through dreams and visions vouchsafed to some man in authority. In these phenomena Warneck sees interpositions of the hand of God in which He condescends to the childish thoughts of the savage. Finally, there is God's chiefest gift to the missionary—the seeking souls, dispersed through heathenism, who have broken in their hearts with its errors and delusions, and who are waiting with a soul-hunger for the truth and the consolations of the gospel.

Under these influences animistic heathenism begins to weaken within a few years of the first assault. Warneck allows some thirty years longer for the triumph of Christianity under normal conditions over the animistic form of religion. Such was the experience in the field with which he was familiar, and the same process may be traced in other islands of the region, as well as on the Niger, in Uganda and in South Africa. All that is needed is that Christianity should unfold and bring into play its vitalizing and conquering energies. In the enumeration and illustration of these energies Dr. Warneck has not only written a chapter of history, but advanced the theory of missions. In seven ways, he says, the gospel is seen to do its work.

1. The gospel prevails by reason of the assurance of its messengers. The savage is oppressed by a sense of his ignorance and insecurity, and his mental constitution makes him unable to resist the message of the preacher who, speaking with a note of absolute certainty, declares to him in the name of God the nature of this God, together with His promises and commandments. A missionary whose message is indefinite and halting need look for no results even though he could put an open Bible into every hand.

2. The claim that Christianity is a revelation is readily accepted by heathen minds on the animistic plane. 'During the whole of my missionary activity,' says Warneck, 'no heathen ever asked me what proof I had that my message was true, and from God.' Nor had he ever any experience of a convert whose falling away was occasioned by the rise of sceptical doubts in his mind. The objection that this is to be set down to the credulity of the savage is disposed of by the fact that he is naturally inclined to be critical and captious, especially in regard to anything novel or disputable. The only possible explanation is that in the revealed truth there lies a power which overcomes his constitutional mistrust. 'He experiences the truth of the message in his inmost soul. There is that in him which responds to it with the certainty of an echo.' On the other hand, violent and satirical attacks on his own religion are worse than useless.

3. The Christian doctrine of God readily captures the mind of the savage. There are many testimonies to the sense of emancipation wrought by believing in the one living and true God. In the first instance faith commonly lays hold on the thought of God as the Almighty, who is stronger than the spirits, and who works marvels. In Warneck's opinion God responds to this faith by manifestations of His power in protection and healing that transcend the providential experiences of mature Christians who have learned that all things work together for their good. The apprehension of the love of God usually comes later. The heathen are deeply moved by the message that God became man in Christ, but they need to be gradually educated to the significance of the Incarnation as a revelation of the divine love. In general it is found that the Biblical narratives, and especially the story of the life of Christ, cast upon their minds a potent spell. Abstract teaching leaves them unmoved, but the embodied doctrine of the concrete history finds a joyful welcome.

4. Among animistic tribes Christianity largely makes its way as a salvation from the power of

evil spirits, and from the terrors which they inspire. 'What they first lay hold on in the gospel is that Jesus has power over the demons, and that He came to make them, who were in bondage to the devil, children of God.' As was before suggested, it is not Warneck's opinion that this is a deliverance from merely groundless superstitions. He inclines to the view, held by many of the converts, that diabolical influence is a real factor in heathenism, and that it only becomes powerless to bind or harm those who have turned to the living God, and placed themselves under the protection of Christ.

5. The appeal made by the gospel as a salvation from the guilt and power of sin is also responded to, but usually as a later result of teaching and experience. The ordinary sequence is not that the savage is drawn to Christ because he has felt the burden of sin, but that he attains to a conviction of sin because he has learned to believe in the crucified Christ. It is, in fact, the story of the sufferings and the death of Christ which is the effectual means at once of creating an assurance of the love of God, and of bringing home a sense of the humiliation and guilt of sin. 'Only those heathen who at the cross apprehend the love of God, are true Christians filled with the life and the power of God. To prove the efficacy of the preaching of the cross would be to write the whole history of Foreign Missions.'

6. The gospel effects in those who receive it a moral revolution. The new relationship to God evokes a sense of gratitude, and a recognition of the lordship of Christ, which inspire lives of lofty endeavour and of self-sacrificing devotion. It is admitted that the full ethical significance of Christianity is only gradually understood, and that moral progress is very unequal; but there is an immediate renunciation of the grosser sins of heathenism, and many exhibit an earnestness in seeking to be conformed to the likeness of Christ, and also a zeal in spreading the gospel, which may put much of our Western Christianity to the blush.

7. The gospel awakens the hope of eternal life. Of all Christian beliefs this article is the chief stumbling-block to the heathen mind, and a resurrection is absolutely incredible; while those professed Christians who have no genuine religious experience often reserve their assent. But those who have penetrated to the love of God, and who walk by faith in the Son of God, accept it easily as implied in what they already possess.

In conclusion Warneck compares his investigation to spectral analysis. The vital energies of the gospel are many and various, but they proceed from, and can be reduced to, one energy—the power of Christ. 'The course of our inquiry has shown even more clearly what is the beam of white light that we have decomposed: it comes from the person of Jesus Christ, the God-man.'

This powerful book maps out lines of investigation which are certain to be followed out by workers in other fields of heathenism. For the thoughtful supporters of Foreign Missions it is full of light and encouragement, and it is satisfactory to know that it will soon be available for wider circles in an English dress. It must, however, also be said that it maintains certain positions which challenge controversy. For one thing doubt may well be felt, in view of the nature of the providential government of the world, and of the mystery of suffering, if the writer is wise to encourage the heathen to stake their faith in God on the security which He gives them from natural evils. Again, it is with considerable misgiving that one contemplates the reintroduction into modern theology of the doctrine of demoniac agencies which played so large a part in the patristic and mediæval theology. But above all, the question arises whether the diagnosis offered of the genius and diabolic origin of Animism is sound, and if it is to be extended to other forms of heathen religion. Is the language of the missionary towards the higher ethnic faiths to be that which Warneck prescribes towards the animist heathen?—'Ye are in error, under the dominion of a lie, alienated from God, slaves of the devil, without love, impure, hopeless.' It is now generally agreed that this is not true of the great religions of India, or of Mohammedanism. They are imperfect rather than false—operative because of a soul of truth and of goodness that is in them, at least as much as because of concessions which they make to the weakness and sinfulness of human nature. And if the diabolic theory will not hold of all heathen religions, the presumption is that neither is it the complete explanation of any. Even Animism must have held germs of truth, and temporarily fulfilled a providential purpose in the religious education of the human race preparatory to the advent of the perfect and final religion in the gospel of Christ.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

Revelation iii. 20.

'Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.'—R.V.

The Language.

The language is quite clear. But notice how much of it is recollection, almost quotation, of earlier Scripture. Says Dr. Anderson Scott, 'The diction and the thought of the verse alike are full of elusive echoes of the Fourth Gospel, all the more striking that they cannot be recognized as direct quotations.' 'If any man hear my voice' recalls Jn $10^{4.27}$, 'My sheep hear my voice.' 'I will come in to him' recalls Jn 14^{23}, 'We will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' 'Will sup with him, and he with me,' recognizes Christ as both host and feast, and recalls Jn 6^{48}, 'I am the bread of life.' Then the whole invitation seems to be a reminiscence of Cant. 5^{2}. And if that is so, then we have here, as Dr. Anderson Scott says, 'the beginning of the spiritual interpretation of the Song in terms of the relation of Christ to the soul.'

The Circumstances.

The text forms part of the letter addressed to the angel of the Church in Laodicea. Now the Church in Laodicea was a lukewarm Church. It was noted for its want of note; it was characterized by its want of character. And the letter is a letter of severest censure. But the last three verses, of which the text is one, are addressed not to the Church as a whole, but to the individual members of it, and their tone is more encouraging.

Thus the invitation is addressed to Church members. It is addressed to the members of a lukewarm ineffective Church. If the Church is to recover itself it must be through the action of the individuals composing it. And so to each individual member the appeal is made to receive Christ into their hearts by faith.

The Sermon.

The figure is that of a home. A Stranger (who should not be a stranger) arrives and knocks at the door. If He is taken in, the joy of the family is great. For He who was received as guest provides the entertainment. He even becomes Himself the entertainment. And He comes, not as He did when He came to the earth to sojourn for a time and to depart; He comes to abide for ever. 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'

Some of the old painters were fond of painting their pictures in three panels. This picture has three panels—on the one side a Vision of Christ, on the other side a Vision of a Christian, in the centre a Vision of Christ and a Christian together.

I. A Vision of Christ—'Behold I stand at the door and knock.' Christ is always near, but He is determined to reach the very centre of the life, and the way He takes to reach it is wooing the Christian by love, not compelling him by omnipotence.

1. He is always near. He is near in Creation, for 'without him was not anything made that was made.' And He is ever creating anew. He is near in providence. 'His tender mercies,' as the Psalmist says, 'are over all his works,' and He never administers any of His tender mercies from a distance; as on earth so now, He puts forth His hand and touches to heal. He is near in all His works, simply waiting for our recognition and reception of Him. And as He waits He pleads with us.

> The fundamental fact of the religious life is this—that the power and love of God are seeking man; that before we love Him, He loves us. . . . The same principle is to be noticed in regard to all truth. Take, for instance, any scientific discovery of a physical force, like that which we call the force of electricity. There is nothing new about this wonderful power. It has always been about us, playing through the sky, and inviting the mind of man. Then, some day, a few men open their minds to the significance of this force and how it may be applied to the common uses of life.
>
> One of the most impressive things about science to-day is to consider how many other secrets of the universe are at this moment knocking at our doors and waiting to be let in;

and to perceive how senseless and unreceptive we must seem to an omniscient mind, when so much truth is beaten back from our closed minds and wills. It is the same with religious truth. Here are our lives, shut in, limited, self-absorbed; and here are the messages of God, knocking at our door; and between the two only one barrier, the barrier of our own wills. Religious education is simply the opening of the door of the heart; and Christian discipleship is simply that alertness and receptivity which hears the knocking and welcomes God's Spirit.[1]

2. But He is not content to be near, He must be central. The Laodicean Christians were keeping Him outside their interests, outside their affections and activities. This was the reason of their lukewarmness. They believed in Him certainly; and in some degree they must have loved Him; they could not otherwise have been Christians in a city like Laodicea. But did they lavish their wealth of love and enthusiasm upon Him? Could they honestly sing

> Be Thou alone my soul's delight,
> My passion, and my love?

3. And how does He reach the heart? By knocking at the door, not by breaking it down; by respecting the will of man and waiting for its working. He does not annihilate every obstacle and enter the man, because in so doing He would annihilate the man. His demand is for love. And, as there is no fear in love, so is there no compulsion. '*If* any man hear my voice'—it is a little word, but it arrests the hand of Omnipotence.

There is a story told of Holman Hunt's celebrated picture, 'Christ, the Light of the World,' that when the artist had finished the picture a friend called to inspect it at a private interview, and that, after looking at it steadily for a few minutes, he said that the picture was beautiful, but that there seemed to be a strange mistake in it. 'A mistake!' the artist said, 'what do you mean?' 'Well,' was the answer, 'you have painted a door, but there is no handle to it. Whoever heard of a door without a handle?' 'Ah!' replied the artist, 'that is one of the points of the picture. There is no handle to that door. If there were a handle the Saviour would not remain outside waiting for admission. That door can only be opened from the inside.' It is certainly so with the door of the human heart.

II. A Vision of a Christian—'If any man hear my voice and open the door.' It is a vision of a Christian's ignorance, of his wilfulness, and of his hesitation.

1. *His ignorance.* It is ignorance of the love of Christ and the ways in which it manifests itself. Sometimes it manifests itself in evident loving-kindness. But even then the health or the happy home or the prosperity in life is attributed to circumstances or our own deserts. We do not say it is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes. Sometimes it manifests itself in apparent adversity. And then we forget that whom He loveth He chasteneth, and that afterwards chastisement yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness. But the greatest and most culpable ignorance which the Christian shows is ignorance of Christ Himself. As Pearse says, we receive His gifts without receiving Him. 'We think of Christ as One who died on the Cross long since, bearing our sins in His own body on the tree, and through Him we receive our forgiveness. We think of Him as gone up into heaven in great glory, and now, at the right hand of the Father, He is our advocate, through Whom we have the hope of life everlasting. But knowing this only can neither satisfy Him nor us. Then only do we know the joys of our religion, richest, fullest, best, when we find our salvation not *through Him*, but in Him.'[2]

An incident occurred some years ago near Inverness. A beautiful yacht had been sailing in the Moray Firth. The owners of it, two young men, landed at Inverness for a walking tour through the Highlands. But they lost their way, and darkness found them wandering aimlessly about in a very desolate spot. At last about midnight they came upon a cottage and knocked at the door for admittance; but the inmates refused to let them come in. Luckily they found shelter in another house some distance away. Next morning, the inhospitable family learned that the two young men who had knocked in vain at their door were the sons of King Edward VII.[3]

2. *His wilfulness.* If the Laodiceans had only been ignorant they would not have been censured so severely. They wilfully kept Christ out of the centre of thought and occupation. They were willing enough to admit other guests. A minister of the gospel knocked one day at the door of a house in a mission district in which he was visiting. A woman came to the door and listened. 'It's Mr. M.,' she said, 'shall I open the door?' 'Whisht!' came the sound from the room; 'don't let him in.' The family had friends, and they had been drinking together, and the minister was kept outside. Some of the Laodiceans had deliberately pulled a heavy chest across the door. It was a chest full of gold, or else full of the desire

[1] F. G. Peabody, *Mornings in the College Chapel*, pp. 108–109.

[2] M. G. Pearse, *Thoughts on Holiness*, 224.

[3] W. Hay, *God's Looking-Glass*, 91.

for gold, and the one chest is just as difficult to move as the other. But how easy is it when the will is right. Dr. Matheson tells of a woman who was bed-ridden and lived alone. When he knocked at her door, 'Who is there?' she called. And when she knew, 'Just lift the latch,' she said, 'and come in'; and he came in.

3. *His hesitation.* The Laodiceans were lukewarm. They are well represented in the Church to-day. They were not so ignorant or even so wilful as they were divided in interest. They could not make up their minds to give Christ the central place in their life; it might mean so much in the way of change of life, and perhaps unpleasantness. Their excuse was that they were really not good enough yet; give them time for a little preparation. 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof.' It was unreal humility. But there is a humility that is the very atmosphere into which He delights to come.

> Come, even now. But think not here to find
> A lodging, Lord, and converse, to Thy mind:
> The lamp burns low; the hearth is chill and pale,
> Wet through the broken casement pours the gale.
>
> Alas, ill-order'd shews the dreary room;
> The household stuff lies heap'd amidst the gloom,
> The table empty stands, the couch undress'd,
> Ah, what a welcome for the Eternal Guest!
>
> Yet welcome, and to-night; this doleful scene
> Is e'en itself my cause to hail Thee in;
> This dark confusion e'en at once demands
> Thine own bright presence, Lord, and ordering hands.[1]

III. A Vision of Christ and a Christian Together.—'I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.' It is a promise of good company, of lasting friendship, of good fare—all the things that are needed to make a supper delightful.

1. *Good company.* Christ Himself is company enough. How they loved Him who lived with Him on earth. What a fund of stories He had to tell. But He brings the Father with Him. As He says elsewhere, 'And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' And so St. John says, 'Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ.' Nor does the Christian find the entertainment irksome, as he feared, for the Guest takes the burden of entertaining on Himself and becomes the Host. The two disciples at Emmaus constrained Him to go in that He might be their Guest, and He went in; but He gave the blessing and brake the bread.

'Men are anxious enough to boast that they have entertained the lion of the day, the man of some flashy success and momentary notoriety. But what have they gained from such intercourse except an increase of self-conceit? We want to entertain guests who will make us feel humble at our own comparative baseness; who will afford us glimpses of a glory and grace far beyond aught we have attained. Who can do that like Jesus Christ? He is the matchless Guest. How often does He sup with us?'[2]

2. *Lasting friendship.* Not only is there good company, but lasting friendship is formed—'We will abide with him.' 'It is characteristic of human nature that it cements its fondest ties around the table; so much is this the case that it is difficult to conceive of friendship apart from hospitality. Your friend has been to your house, and you have been to his; oft have you dined or supped together. A fact both pleasing and curious is that once we sit at the same table, we understand each other better. Through the bodies of us we seem to arrive at the souls of us, and the seas which roll between these solitary islands are oftentimes happily navigated. Life would be strange without the supper-table and all it represents. In our homes and institutions, even in our churches, it plays an important part. And in our spiritual intercourse the word "sup" has a sacred significance. On the eve of Calvary our Saviour supped with His disciples. We, His followers, follow the example, and deem it our most sacred ordinance to sup together in remembrance of Him. And the silence of that hour is sweet to our souls. We draw nearer one to another and realize that He is in the midst.'[3]

3. *Good fare.* For it is of His own providing. It is the Bread of Life; it is the love that went to death, that out of death life might be born to us; it is the love that loved us everlastingly and now is ours through Calvary and the glory. It is grace to help us in every time of need.

But it is of our providing also. We love Him because He first loved us. 'It is just when we waken all the love of our hearts in the service of

[1] H. C. G. Moule, *Thoughts on the Spiritual Life*, 184.

[2] L. A. Johnson, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxiv. 422.

[3] E. Rees, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxvi. 372.

Christ, not till then, that life's great feast of joy begins. When in the deepest heart and soul of us there is such earnestness of devotion that it really brings our heart to touch the heart of Christ, our soul to touch the soul of Christ, our life to lay itself upon the life of Christ—then it is that, with the whole world shut away, He who has all joy can most fully bestow on us His gifts of joy, and most clearly speak to us His words of joy, and most generously spread for us His feast of joy.'[1]

Travelling some years ago in a thinly populated part of South Africa with a cart and horses I got belated on the way, and, after a long day in the hot sun and over dusty plains, towards evening I saw a small house not far from the road. Having no food with me either for myself or my horses, I was compelled to turn thither and beg hospitality for the night. I was very kindly received by a Dutch Boer and his wife who lived there with their three little children. They welcomed me to share what they had. Their house was small, consisting of only two rooms, and evidently they were poor, but cleanly. As evening closed upon us, I wondered what I was going to have for supper. The table was laid, and they invited me to join them in their simple meal consisting of dry bread and coffee without sugar. Before eating, the farmer said 'grace' over the food, asking God's blessing upon these His gifts. I shall never forget that meal. The hunger of the guest, the heartiness and evident sincerity of the hosts, made it more enjoyable to me than a feast at a rich man's table. After supper, before we retired—I to pass the night on a 'shake-down' in the dining-room and kitchen combined—the family Bible was brought out and a chapter read, after which the master of the house committed us to God in prayer.

Conclusion.—Among the sermons, in Old French, of the Franciscan friar, Oliver Maillard, which have come down to us from the fifteenth century, there is a remarkable one on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It is altogether occupied with the thought of the Holy Spirit dwelling within us as in a hostel or inn, and the entertainment that is provided. Quaintly the preacher says that to make the entertainment good the inn of the conscience should have three serving-maids—Prayer, Obedience, and Peace. The office of the first is to invite the Guest to enter. The office of the second is to open wide the door that He may enter freely and find a hearty and sincere welcome. The office of the third is to receive Him joyfully and make Him feel at home.[2]

[1] W. Clark, *Meanings and Methods of the Spiritual Life*, 104.

Literature.

On Laodicea.—W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, I. i. and ii., *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, 413; J. G. C. Anderson, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1897), 404; M. L. Smith, 'The Cities of the Seven Churches,' in *The Churchman*, xxii. (1908), 744; W. M. Ramsay, in *D.B.*, iii. 44; W. J. Woodhouse, in *E.B.*, iii. col. 2708; A. Souter, in *S.D.B.*, 531.

On Lukewarmness.—E. B. Pusey, *Parochial and Cathedral Sermons*, 90, 377; A. Maclaren, *Creed and Conduct*, 313; F. G. Peabody, *Mornings in the College Chapel*, ii. 42; C. Spurgeon, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* (1902), 505; T. H. Darlow, *The Upward Calling*, 294; G. O. L. Thomson, *The Messages to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 45; A. T. Pierson, *The Making of a Sermon*, 239.

On the Text.—W. H. M. H. Aitken, *Mission Sermons*, iii. 68; W. Arnot, *The Anchor of the Soul*, 274; W. Clark, *Meanings and Methods of the Spiritual Life*, 94; J. Culross, *Behold I stand at the Door and knock*, 11; M. Dix, *Christ at the Door of the Heart*, 1; W. G. Elmslie, *Memoir and Sermons*, 81; P. T. Forsyth and J. A. Hamilton, *Pulpit Parables*, 177; W. Hay, *God's Looking-Glass*, 84; C. Jerdan, *For the Lord's Table*, 253; J. E. McFadyen, *Thoughts for Silent Hours*, 201; A. Macleod, *Talking to the Children*, 131; G. Matheson, *Moments on the Mount*, 144; J. J. van Oosterzee, *Year of Salvation*, ii. 309; J. K. Pike, *Unfailing Goodness and Mercy*, 23; J. C. Ryle, *The Christian Race*, 280; A. Smellie, *In the Hour of Silence*, 223; E. B. Speirs, *A Present Advent*, 113; D. Wright, *The Power of an Endless Life*, 236; *Church of England Pulpit*, xxx. 1 (J. Maskell), xxxix. 1 (B. Maturin); *Christian World Pulpit*, x. 166 (J. S. Exell), xviii. 189 (J. Vaughan), xxxii. 342 (R. Glover), xxxiv. 215 (G. Macdonald), xlvi. 191 (M. S. Wright), lix. 21 (H. S. Holland), lxiv. 420 (L. A. Johnson), lxvi. 371 (E. Rees), lix. 387 (G. C. Morgan), lxx. 173 (S. M. Crothers), lxiii. 1 (J. Warschauer); *Contemporary Pulpit*, 1st ser. viii. 359 (C. W. Furse); *Twentieth Century Pastor*, xxv. 1 (T. Kelly).

[2] See J. Maskell, in *Church of England Pulpit*, xxx. 3.

Clauda or Cauda?

A STUDY IN ACTS xxvii. 16.

By J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., late Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge.

It was my fortune on one of my Mediterranean voyages to pass to the north of an island, near the coast of Crete, along whose opposite shore that Alexandrian corn-ship ran, which had St. Paul on board, when the great gale broke upon them which tossed them about for so many days in Adria. And I remember how, on hearing from the captain the name of the island in its modern form, which is very near to the Italian Gozo, a name which recurs for another island to the south of Malta, I recalled the reading of the famous Codex Vaticanus in Ac 27^{16}, according to which the island was called Cauda (Καῦδα) and not Clauda (Κλαῦδα), as the most of the New Testament authorities had it, and the Authorized English Bible. It seemed to be just one of those instances where the appeal to geography had settled the reading definitely and finally in favour of the text of Codex B. One is not, therefore, much surprised to find Clauda in such disfavour that it is not even honoured by an entry or cross-reference in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.[1]

And the student who is beginning Textual Criticism would, I suppose, have very little difficulty in settling the matter: if he knows that B with some slight additional attestation reads Καῦδα, but that ℵ (the Sinaitic MS.) and practically all the rest of the Greek authorities read Κλαῦδα, he will probably say that one of these readings arises easily out of the other by transcriptional error, and since the modern Greek name is Γαυδονῆσι (the island of Gaudos), and the modern Italian name Gozzo, there can be no doubt that the form Κλαῦδα must be abandoned. The judgment would be the same as that of Sir William Ramsay in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, that, 'amid the varying forms of the name the preference must be given to the forms in which the letter L is omitted, *as is proved beyond dispute* by the modern forms Gaudho in Greek and Gozzo in Italian.' The confidence of the underlined words exactly expresses my own feeling as we ran along the northern shore of the island; I remember explaining the matter with the air of an instructed scribe to the captain of the ship!

It is assumed in this statement of the case as one in which the true reading is recovered without dispute, that one of the readings is true, and the other false: that the island did not have two names: that the name which it really had can be selected from the complete forms by the assistance of the modern geography. The alternative that both forms may be correct appears to be excluded. If that is so, then B must be right, and the others wrong.

It should, however, have awakened our suspicions to find the condemned reading so well attested outside of Biblical and Theological writings: Ramsay has pointed out that the form Καῦδα is supported by Καυδώ in Suidas; by Καῦδος in *Notitia Episcopatuum*, viii. 240; by *Gaudus* in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iv. 12 (61); and by *Pomponius Meta.* ii. 114. But then, on the other hand, the form Clauda is attested in the form Κλαῦδος by Hierocles, *Synecdemos*, 651, 2, by Ptolemy, iii. 15, 8, and by the *Notitia Episcopatuum*, ix. 149; while the form Κλαυδία is found in the *Stadiasmus Maris Magni*, § 328. It is clear that all these writers cannot be harmonized into a consentient form by the hypothesis of a transcriptional error; nor are they under the influence of a variation, this way or that way, in the text of the New Testament. We are therefore driven to the hypothesis that both forms are lawful, and that the idea that the form Cauda can be 'justified beyond dispute' is no longer tenable, without further investigation. Indeed it seems, at first estimate of the new situation, as if the form Καῦδα, which is the modern survival, might be younger than the other in regard to origin, in which case there would certainly be a reopening of the question in favour of editing Clauda. But this is the very point where we want further information: it seems clear that the two forms co-exist in the time of the Acts of the Apostles, and what we have to do is to dig a little deeper into their history, for we are now definitely detached from the paleo-

[1] In Cheyne's *Encyclopædia* the name is discussed under Clauda, with a cross-reference from Cauda.

graphical explanation of the variant, and in search of the meaning of the names and the cause of their interchange.

The first suggestion would naturally be that the name was Phœnician,[1] for we have a second island of the same name, or what seems to be the same name, in the neighbourhood of Malta; and as Malta is probably Phœnician (מלט = 'escape,' and cf. Ac 28[1], 'when we were *escaped*, we knew that the island was called *Scape*'), it seems natural to ascribe a similar origin to the Maltese Gozo. Phœnician inscriptions encourage the belief. If this were correct, the case against an original Κλαῦδα would be established, for Κλαῦδα cannot be a Semitic form.

But the matter is not so easily settled, there is the further alternative that the name might be Cretan.

August Fick, in his *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, discusses the occurrence in Cretan place-names of forms coincident with or closely related to place-names in Asia Minor, especially in Caria and Lydia. In the course of the study of these coincidences which connect one stage of the Cretan civilization with Asia Minor and outlying parts of Greece, he comes to a treaty made between the people of Gortyna and the inhabitants of Kauda: (Γορτυνίοις καὶ τοῖς ἐν Καυσοῖ Φοικίονσι), upon which he remarks that 'the island is called both Γαυδῶς and Κλαῦδος. The form with L seems to be quite Carian. We find on Attic tribute lists the Carian Κλαυνδῆς.' Fick goes on to explain the relation between the forms Κλαῦδος and Κλαῦνδος, but this we need not discuss. If he is right in his parallel, and it is one case out of many which he brings forward, the origin of Cauda is not in Crete, nor in Phœnicia, but in Caria. And the curious thing is, that Fick brings up from the depths of antiquity the very same forms which we find contending with one another in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the contemporary literature. So we conclude that the names are Cretan, and of the highest antiquity, with a possible Carian ancestry behind the Cretan.

Both forms are, therefore, substantially genuine, and for our purposes equally ancient. Cauda has outlasted Clauda, but they must have started very near together. Unfortunately our ignorance of the Carian language and history prevents us from saying what the meaning of the name is.

[1] See Schräder, *Phön. Spr.* 105.

Returning to the criticism of the New Testament, we find that the problem is much changed from what we started with. The received text has Κλαύδην, which shows an editorial hand correcting the grammar to an accusative (cf. καλούμενον Καλοὺς Λιμένας in 27[8]), but betrays also that the form the editors were correcting was in all probability Clauda, and not Cauda. And apparently every Greek hand has Clauda, except Codex B and the seventh-century (Cesarean) corrector of the Sinaiticus. On the other hand, amongst the versions, B (which appears to be without its usual Egyptian support) has the backing of the Peshito and the Vulgate. What are we to say in such a division of authorities?

It is certain that, at some point, very early in the transmission of the text, there has been a deliberate alteration of the reading: it has either been changed from Cauda to Clauda, or conversely. Let us try the two hypotheses.

1. Clauda was the original reading, and was changed to Cauda by some one who knew the Mediterranean navigation and geography. This would very naturally be the work of an Alexandrian scribe, perpetuated in Codex B.

Objection: this leaves out of account the reading of the Peshito, which can hardly be under Alexandrian influence. Moreover, it is conceded that if Luke wrote Clauda, he got the name from Alexandrian sailors with whom he was travelling; in that case, why should an Alexandrian hand have corrected it?

2. Cauda was the original reading, and was changed to Clauda: the change might very well have been made in Antioch: the Antioch text of the first period would be reflected on the Peshito and therefore should have exhibited Cauda; while the Byzantine (Antiochene) tradition of a later date shows clearly the reading Clauda.

Objection: this does not explain how the Coptic text gets Clauda; for it is difficult to put this text under Antioch influence. The Antioch revision appears to have changed the grammatical form (but not the spelling of the name?).

The two series of objections land us in a dilemma: we cannot explain the Peshito reading on the hypothesis of a primitive Clauda, nor the Coptic reading on that of a primitive Cauda.

If one of these readings has been wrongly edited, it is almost certainly the Coptic.

We throw out the suggestion, therefore, that the Coptic originally read Cauda with Codex B. In that case the scale is turned. We have an original reading Cauda, attested by Antiochene and Alexandrian antiquity. This has been changed at Cesarea by some critical hand. The Antioch revision has taken up the Cesarean reading and perpetuated it. We conclude, therefore, to edit Cauda, with Westcott and Hort, and against Tischendorf. The result is, as so often happens in this kind of work, not exactly what we expected when we came across the proofs of the extreme antiquity of both readings. It looked as if a later and popular form Cauda had displaced an archaic Clauda. But this appears not to be the case. It is true that Clauda is, historically, the dying form: but it is a correct form, and its introduction into the N.T. may, after all, be only a piece of pedantry.

We have shown conclusively that paleographical considerations have to be ruled out of the argument, whose balance seems now to be in favour of the reading of Codex B. But it is a balance that might easily be turned by a fragment of fresh evidence.

Incidentally we have arrived at two curious results: first, there is a clear proof that the paleographer is sometimes not the final authority for readings; second, there is a suspicion that some early hand has revised the place-names in the New Testament.

Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

By the Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., Oxford.

1. Of the Triumph-joy.

τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ (2 Co 2^{14}).

There is a remarkable richness and suggestiveness in the language of this doxology. The word θριαμβεύοντι (*leadeth in triumph*) awakens in the mind a host of subtle associations, which carry us back, on the one hand, to the beginnings of Greek tragedy in the θρίαμβος,[1] a hymn sung in honour of Dionysus; on the other hand, to the colour and movement of a Roman *triumphus*.

In his *Religious Teachers of Greece* the late Dr. Adam has dwelt on the significance of that extraordinary drama, the *Bacchae* of Euripides. The play stands alone among the creations of a mind which for the most part shows itself in revolt from the national faith. Euripides is in effect the new theologian of Athens in the fifth century before Christ: but in the *Bacchae* he strikes into a vein of religious feeling or emotion, as if he were deliberately endeavouring to do justice to the inwardness and power of the mystery-element in the old Greek religion. Though the *Bacchae* may not amount to a recantation of a previous rationalism, it is at least the tacit acknowledgment of the potency of enthusiasm in the experiences of the soul. Nothing can be more sympathetic than his spiritualization of Dionysus-worship. The *motif* of the drama is 'The world's Wise are not wise.'[2] Dionysus is introduced to the conventional life of Thrace as 'a god of the wild northern mountains, a god of intoxication, of inspiration, a giver of superhuman and immortal life.'[3] His cult is intimately connected with certain forms of tree-worship, more particularly the vine. He is the wine-god, banisher of care and giver of peace.

It is well known that Orphism, which was really a revival of religion on mystic and emotional lines, and originated in the sixth century B.C., laid hold of the Dionysus-cult and transformed it. But in his portraiture of the Dionysus-worship Euripides appears to go back to the primitive pre-Orphic

[1] The more familiar word is διθύραμβος. Cf. the word ἐπιχορηγία for another link between St. Paul's language and Greek drama.

[2] See *Bacchae*, 395: τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία.

[3] See Introd. Note, G. Murray's translation of the play.

setting of the faith, just as Sir Edwin Arnold, in his *Light of Asia*, reverts to the legendary *fontes* of Buddhism. Now, the frenzy of the Bacchanal has its terrible side, as, *e.g.*, in the tearing asunder and slaying of wild animals; while there is something revolting to the religious instinct of civilized humanity in the semi-sensuous fury of the whirling, dancing Mænad. But such phenomena take their place among the multitudinous expressions of religious enthusiasm familiar to the student of Comparative Religion; and Euripides undoubtedly brings out the nobler and more beautiful elements of the worship in those touches which emphasize the kinship with nature and the passion for personal purity characteristic of the god-possessed devotee. One may quote in illustration Professor G. Murray's exquisite translation of one of the choruses of the *Bacchae* ('Some Maidens')—

Will they ever come to me, ever again,
The long, long dances,
On through the dark till the dim stars wane?
Shall I feel the dew on my throat, and the stream
Of wind in my hair? Shall our white feet gleam
In the dim expanses?
. . . . . .
O wildly labouring, fiercely fleet,
Onward yet by river and glen . . .
Is it joy or terror, ye storm-swift feet? . . .
To the dear lone lands untroubled of men,
Where no voice sounds, and amid the shadowy green
The little things of the woodland live unseen.

Then follows a characteristic expression of the Euripidean faith or philosophy.

What else is Wisdom? What of man's endeavour
Or God's high grace, so lovely and so great?
To stand from fear set free, to breathe and wait;
To hold a hand uplifted over Hate;
And shall not Loveliness be loved for ever?

In the history of Christianity religious exultation has taken on many forms, fantastic and even grotesque, which remind us of the strange frenzies of pagan religions. One may mention the 'tarantism' of mediæval saints, the levitations of some of St. Francis' followers, and the curious phenomena of Shakerism. That St. Paul recognized in the Christian joy a kind of intoxication is proved by his injunction to the Asiatic converts, 'Be not drunken with wine, wherein is excess; but be ye filled with the Spirit' (Eph 5^{18}). The Christian religion has a place for the *Gott-getrunkene*, the God-intoxicated souls; and it cannot escape us that the phraseology of St. Paul's ascription of praise in the passage before us recalls those earlier forms of religious emotionalism with which the exultation of the Christian saint may at least be compared, though its source is wholly different and its expression more ordered and self-controlled.

But the θρίαμβος of Greece became the *triumphus* of Rome. The central object of Roman worship was the god Mars (Mavors, Marmor), and the most ancient priesthoods of Rome were consecrated to his cult. Among these—once more by way of religious analogy—we may mention the *Salii*—a band of youths who in the month of March performed a dance in honour of the god and accompanied it by a song. A litany has been preserved of the twelve 'Field Brothers'—the *Fratres Arvales*, a college dedicated to the worship of *Dea Dia*, the creative goddess—which curiously enough gives us the word 'triumpe' as an exclamation of joy:

Enos, Marmor, iuvato!
Triumpe![1]

But the term was destined to express the celebration in pomp and splendour and processional magnificence of a great national victory. Was the Apostle moved to use the word θριαμβεύω by reflecting upon such a scene as that which is depicted on the bas-relief of the Arch of Titus at Rome? He did not, indeed, live to see that particular triumph into which were imported the spoils of the Holy City—the seven-branched candlestick, the golden trumpets, and the shew-bread; but as a *civis Romanus* he would be familiar with the general features of the spectacle. The *triumphus* was granted only to a dictator, consul, or prætor, and in imperial times to the emperor alone, because the conquering generals were merely his *legati*. Let us imagine the streets adorned with garlands and the temples opened. The procession was headed by the great officials of the state and the senate, followed in order by the trumpeters, the captured spoils and trophies of the fight, the white sacrificial bulls, the prisoners spared to grace the triumph prior to imprisonment or execution, the musicians, and finally the general himself. '*Io triumphe*,' shouted the spectators, as the splendid pageant moved slowly up the Forum to the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter. There is a touch of the brilliant scene in the ὀσμή of the Apostle's words. The air is filled with odours of spice flung around

[1] See Mommsen, *History of Rome*, i. 230.

or burnt by attendants. In the only other passage where θριαμβεύω occurs (Col 2[15]), we read of Christ displaying (ἐδειγμάτισεν) the powers of evil like captives, or trophies in the procession, with the addition of θριαμβεύσας, 'leading them in triumph'[1] on His Cross.

We pass from these side-lights on the history and meaning of the word and note that while the Colossian passage depicts Christ's triumph over His foes, the Apostle here conceives of God leading His subjugated saints in triumph, chained as captives to His car. Their defeat—the subduing of their rebellious passions and wills—is the secret of an abounding joy; for they share in the Conqueror's triumph, not as sullen, broken-hearted, and doomed captives, but as those who rejoice to be His prisoners and δούλοι, and are proud to be trophies which grace His victorious might.

Further, let us note the 'always' (πάντοτε) and 'in every place' (ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ)—expressions typical of the universal outlook of the Apostle whenever he deals with Christian experience. Times and places are all alike to him in the transcendentalism of his union with Christ. How closely he allies Θεῷ and Χριστῷ in his thought here, as elsewhere! Whatever the environment of the Christian life, and wherever it may be lived, the source of joy lies in the fact that Christians are 'in Christ,' are so united with Him as to partake in the perennial gladness of His victory. The victory was won on the Cross: our victory over sin and self is involved in our crucifixion with Him—that identification of humanity with its Representative, by which the believing enter on the experience of forgiveness and inward peace. To St. Paul such a life as that which the saint lived 'in Christ,' was, so to speak, intoxicated with the sheer, vivid consciousness of His reality and power; or rather it might be likened to a triumphal march in the train of One, whom the author of the Epistle to Hebrews calls the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, 'the author (or captain) of their salvation.' Out of it springs a fragrance diffused through the air, invisibly interpenetrating the community—the 'fragrance' that springs from 'the knowledge of Him.' To know Christ is to carry an aroma of beauty into the strifes and vulgarities of human intercourse. Flung back from the stress and strain of things, often discomfited and baffled and forlorn, we rest on that incommunicable γνῶσις, our apprehension of Christ. In itself, in its fulness, we may never be able to unfold it to others; but 'the fragrance' of it—the sweetness as of a hidden violet—is borne on the breeze and manifested in every place.

Wm. Watson sings of the first spring skylark fluttering in the serene upper air and carolling in gladness above the vexed earth,

> O high above the home of tears,
> Eternal Joy, sing on!

But the Apostle felt a kinship with the Divine Joy, and a near fellowship with it in the midst of tribulation and perplexity. It was not something above him; but something inwrapt and indwelling in his consciousness. God 'setteth in pain the jewel of His joy.' And God was ever leading him in triumph with the great army of His saints. He stood not alone, but encompassed by a great brotherhood, 'a joy in widest commonalty spread.'

By this intoxication of spiritual joy, as if caught in the sweep of some world-wide triumphal progress, St. Paul is an exemplar for all time to the Christian who is apt to lose heart or faint in faith and prayer and hope. For with all the checks and drags upon its movement, the car of triumph, of Divine victory, still advances. Who cannot see the signs of the Son of Man in the renascence of Turkey, in the awakening of the Far East, and even in the passion of democratic ideals which infects great areas of society—in the weary sigh of multitudes awakened to the largeness and richness of life, precursor, as it seems, of some wider social reformation that will give us saner conditions of life and a more even distribution of the sources of well-being? When we centre our faith in Christ and draw from His teaching the eternal strength of wisdom and receive from His spirit the power that overcomes sin, God will verily lead us in triumph. There would be less pessimism, less concession to the secularism of the age, less falling away from a high ideal, if our hearts, like the Apostle's, were open to the potent assurances of the Divine Joy, and we could feel through the air the measured march of the army of the living God in its steady triumphal progress to the ultimate victory of faith and righteousness.

[1] R.V. 'triumphing over them in it'; but there seems no good reason for varying from the translation 'lead in triumph' which the R.V. gives in 2 Co 2[14].

Literature.

ZAHN'S INTRODUCTION.

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Theodor Zahn. Translated from the Third German Edition under the Direction and Supervision of Professor Melanchthon W. Jacobus. (*T. & T. Clark.* Three Vols. 36s. net.)

THIS is the most important translation that has been made from the German since the issue of Dorner's *Person of Christ.* We mean in the department of Theology. And we have not forgotten Harnack's *History of Dogma.* A translation of much more consequence than the *History of Dogma* was Harnack's *What is Christianity?* and it probably had ten English readers for one that the *History of Dogma* had. We have not forgotten any of Harnack's books. But Zahn, though less volcanic, is as great a force as Harnack, and he is much more the man of a single book.

There is one respect in which Harnack has an advantage over Zahn. His style is popular. But this only gives increased importance to the translation of Zahn's *Introduction* into English. Readers of German may prefer Harnack's books in the original. But the men who possess Zahn's two bulky volumes in the German, and have been wrestling with them since their publication, will be the most forward in their welcome of this readable English translation. Zahn himself is well aware of the obscurity and difficulty of his style. With some humour he refers to it in the preface which he has written to the English edition. 'I still recall,' he says, 'often with very mingled feelings, the words with which E. Renan once described my book on Ignatius of Antioch (1873): "Quiconque aura le courage de lire ces 650 pages, écrites d'un style obscure et embarassé, possédera réelement les élements pour résoudre la question; mais tout le travail du raisonnement et de la critique restera bien à sa charge." For this criticism, certainly not flattering, I have found a twofold consolation. Whoever attempts to answer definitely a question complex in character and long discussed without satisfactory results, and to prove in as thorough a manner as possible that his is the only possible answer, will certainly not succeed in writing an elegant romance such as the brilliant Frenchman's *Vie de Jésus.*'

That is well and justly said. For if the difference is great in popularity of style between Renan's *Life of Jesus* and Zahn's *Introduction*, greater still is the difference in their permanent value.

The translation was undertaken soon after the issue of the work in German. It has been longer in appearing than was at first expected, partly because of the difficulty already referred to. But the delay has been a twofold gain. In the first place, it has enabled the translators to make this a translation not of the first but of the third and last edition of the work. Indeed, it is never safe to translate the first edition of a German book. The other advantage is that in the years that have elapsed since the work was first published, criticism of the New Testament has been steadily returning from excursions, not to say wild-goose chases, in various directions, and has been settling down to an acceptance of the results which Zahn arrives at. Thus the English edition appears at a time which assures it not only a wide circulation, but also authoritative influence.

To the Hartford Theological Seminary, and especially to Professor Jacobus, readers of the New Testament owe a deep debt of gratitude.

ANIMALS.

THE PLACE OF ANIMALS IN HUMAN THOUGHT. By the Countess Evelyn Martinengo-Cesaresco. (*Fisher Unwin.* 12s. 6d. net.)

Your true lover of animals is a woman. Not the old maid with her parrot and her cat. Not any particular woman or *obiter factum* of woman. But woman as woman, with her intellect merged in emotion, giving more than she wants to get, recognizing that the parrot and the cat need her much more than she needs them.

And woman's attitude to the animals is the right attitude. Mankind got the dominion over them—'Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.' But in the Book of God 'dominion over' always means 'sympathy with,' 'sacrifice for.' It was just be-

cause the princes in Israel forgot this fact that the kingdom of Israel came to an end. The true attitude to the animals is woman's attitude, obtaining the dominion by sympathy and holding it by self-sacrifice.

And this is a woman's book. Women do not write books as men do. If the proper standard for the writing of a book is a book well written by a man, then women cannot write books. But no doubt this is one of the many ways in which men have exceeded God's purpose, setting up a standard for women as well as for themselves. This is a woman's book. The chapters begin far away from the place at which a man would begin them, and end as far away on the other side. Yet they contain the things they were meant to contain, not in set statement perhaps, but in touches, flashes, exclamations, leaving the right impression, and leaving it so that it will not be forgotten.

The Countess Martinengo-Cesaresco has dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. She obtained it first by giving of herself to her own cat and parrot. Then she annexed all other cats and parrots in all the history of the world, by reading the literature of the Egyptians and the Greeks, of the Hebrews and the Hindus, and by studying their works of art. The book is full of beautiful illustrations, literary and photographic. Here is Buddha pacifying an intoxicated elephant; there is Christ in the wilderness with the wild beasts. And these two moments in their life bring Buddha and Christ nearer to one another than all the comparisons that an endless literature has produced. Where did St. Mark find that touch of his, 'and he was with the wild beasts'? Did a woman give it to him? Was the first account of the temptation told to Mary? And did Mary give it to the Evangelists? It is such a revelation of the Redeemer as a woman would be sure to remember.

THE FOLK-LORE OF WALES.

FOLK-LORE AND FOLK-STORIES OF WALES. By Marie Trevelyan. With an Introduction by E. Sidney Hartland, F.S.A. (*Elliot Stock.* 10s. 6d. net.)

In his introduction Mr. Sidney Hartland tells us that this book is full of interest to students of tradition, and to Welshmen whether students or not, and to 'that omnivorous but capricious abstraction known as the general reader.' He might have added that it is interesting to the modern student of Religion, and most of all to the student of that form of religion which is known as Mysticism.

The book is occupied primarily with the folk-lore of Glamorgan, and it is folk-lore at first hand. 'The author,' says Mr. Hartland, 'has had special facilities for the work. Not merely is she herself a child of Wales, enthusiastically devoted to the memories and the lore of her people; she has had the advantage of inheriting a manuscript collection made by her late father, to which have been added contributions from other members of her family on both sides. Living among the people, she has made it her business to seek out those who were best versed in tradition, and to take methodical notes of the information they put at her disposal. The result, I venture to think, is a work which fills many a gap of the previous record, and helps us materially to an insight into the mind of bygone generations.'

Now, throughout the whole of this collection of folk-lore and folk-stories of Wales there is a certain note to be heard. As the favourite music of the Welsh is commonly pitched in the minor key, so that note is well described as one of 'sombre mysticism.' It is most insistent in the chapters on the Cwn Annwn, Corpse-Candles and Phantom Funerals, Death and Transformation. Is it a note that is confined to the folk-lore of Wales? No, it is universal. But it is found most unmistakably where is found the union of deep and easily excited emotion, passionate religious conviction, and vivid popular imagination. And that union is found supremely among the Celtic populations of Scotland, Wales, and Brittany.

Here is a case of the corpse-candle: 'At Disgwilfa, about twelve miles from Carmarthen, a mysterious light was seen glimmering in the corner of a field, where the branches of a tall sycamore-tree made a deep shadow. For quite a year, winter and summer alike, this light appeared, and was seen by several persons, who commented upon the strange occurrence. The light glimmered in the corner, about two or three feet from the gate leading into the field, and was always seen between "dusk and dawn." At last the mysterious light disappeared, and the very next day a gentleman much respected in the district "came

to his end" by a fall from his horse. He was hunting, and, while taking the gate, fell over his horse's head, and was killed on the very spot where the glimmering light or corpse-candle had been seen.'

Now, how do you account for this glimmering light? You cleverly suggest that it is the product of noxious gases, the vapour of swampy places, where the mysterious lights are known as jack-o'-lantern or will-o'-the-wisp. But the explanation will not be received. A distinct difference is made between the will-o'-the-wisp and the corpse-candle. The corpse-candle is often seen in the house, and sometimes in the room of a person about to die, or in the dwelling of somebody related to the individual.

The Books of the Month.

Those to whom the Bible is still a single book, and every part of it equally inspired, find nothing in it more perplexing than the poverty and the lateness of its references to the future life. And even those who accept the doctrine of development, in the most unqualified exposition of it, are puzzled to understand how the Jews got on without a doctrine of immortality, and how they escaped so long having one when the nations around them mostly had it, and some of them made so much of it. The Rev. T. H. Sprott, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Wellington, New Zealand, has found an explanation.

Mr. Sprott has written a book on *Modern Study of the Old Testament and Inspiration* (Cambridge University Press; 3s. net). It is a book for beginners. It is sent forth to enable the layman who has been somewhat moved from his moorings by vague impressions of what the Higher Criticism is, and what it has done to the Bible, to find good anchorage again. It is sent forth with much modesty, but also with plenty of learning and insight. And among other things it contains this about the early Hebrews and immortality.

The Hebrews, says Mr. Sprott, were at first ancestor-worshippers. As they came to know Jehovah better, the whole system of ancestor-worship became repugnant to them. But when they cast away the superstitious elements of their belief in the world to come, they cast away the belief itself. The future life seemed so bound up with the heathen conception of it that they abandoned them both together. Then the time came when Israel was ready for a faith in the future life which should have both moral and spiritual value. That faith was reborn in connexion with the conception of the Kingdom of God. It first appears, says Mr. Sprott, in the Book of Isaiah. The passage is Is 26^{19}, 'Thy dead men (Israel!) shall arise, and the inhabitants of the dust shall awake and shout for joy; for a dew of lights is thy dew, and the earth shall produce the shades.'

Messrs. Constable have now nearly completed their series of 'Religions Ancient and Modern'; but as it often happens with a series of books, the last volume is first and the first last. After the issue of seventeen volumes there comes *The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion*, by Professor James H. Leuba of Bryn Mawr College in the United States (1s. net).

The same publishers' 'Philosophies Ancient and Modern' has only just made a good start. The new volume is *Schopenhauer*, by Thomas Whittaker (1s. net).

The Rev. J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., published in 1899 a book which he called *The Power of a Surrendered Life*. In 1909 he publishes another book and calls it *The Surrendered Life* (Morgan & Scott; 6d. net). That is a mistake. Dr. Chapman's books are worth inquiring for, and where is the bookseller who will be able to keep these two titles distinct?

When our religion is individualistic, when we are most concerned with 'What shall *I* do to be saved?' we find the Gospels full of individual dealing. When our religion becomes socialistic, when we are occupied with the thought, 'What shall I do to save another?' we find the Gospels greatly occupied with crowds and communities; and we discover that Christ was a social reformer. Then it is that we marvel at men like Mill and Mazzini, and still more at men like Frederic Harrison and W. M. Salter in our own day, who have said, and still say, that Christianity is deficient in social morality. For an exposition of *The Social Teaching of the Bible*, from beginning to end, see the book under that title which has just been published by Mr. Culley (2s. net). It

contains short chapters, thirteen in all, on the social teaching of the Psalter, the social teaching of St. Paul, and so on, each chapter written by a different author, but every author a Wesleyan Methodist and a scholar, and the whole capably edited by the Rev. S. E. Keeble.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have issued the third volume of their *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. It runs from CHAMIER to DRÆNDORF. The proportion of short biographies to theological or religious articles is not quite so great as in the second volume, but it is still very great. This is inevitable. For this abridged edition of Herzog retains practically all the biographies of the original, and adds to them a small number of British and a large number of American biographies.

For the most part the additional biographies are quite short, and most of the biographies in the original work are much shortened also. It is a pity that just a little more space had not been given to them, so that they might have included some estimate of the theological position of their subject. In a few cases they do include this, and the information is very welcome. But it is difficult to estimate a man's theological value within a few sentences, and sometimes the writer shows us how it should not be done. This is what we have on Joseph Cook, for example, in addition to the usual information: 'His conservatism was most pronounced and his dogmatism also. He was immensely popular, and really was astonishingly well informed. As a public speaker he was always vehement, but not always easily intelligible.' Unhappily Joseph Cook is not here now to read that. We should have seen how intelligible he could be.

Much of the space is occupied with the Bible, for it is part of the idea of the work to make a dictionary of the Bible unnecessary. But that is not so appropriate either to America or to Britain as it is to Germany, because in English-speaking countries every one who is interested in the Bible already possesses a Bible dictionary. Something might have been gained if a great effort had been made to show how the doctrines and institutions of the New Testament passed into the history of the Church, and how they were developed or dropped throughout its history. But that idea does not seem to have occurred to any of the editors, German or American. There are two articles on Conversion, but they have no relation to one another. Seeberg's is a short statement of the Scripture evidence; Beckwith's is a most disappointing summary of the psychology of the subject.

To return for a moment to the biographies. It is surprising that the editors of an Encyclopædia, in giving a list of an author's works, should have omitted his contributions to encyclopædias and dictionaries. Bishop Chase has never written anything that cost him more, or that has done more for the progress of scholarship, than his articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible*; and Conder's article on JERUSALEM in the same work is as good as any six of the separate small books which are mentioned at his name.

The bibliographies deserve special notice. They are full and generally accurate. There are omissions, of course. Smellie's work should have been given at the end of the article on the Covenanters. The editors should certainly see in future that the best edition of a work is given. Tylor's *Primitive Culture* is referred to as 'London, 1903,' but the book was published as early as 1871. And, to mention one more, the second edition of Julian's *Hymnology* (1907) supersedes the first edition of 1892.

Messrs. Longmans have published a new edition of Mr. George Macaulay Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (6s. net). The book was first published in February 1899. A new edition was issued in June the same year. This was reprinted in January 1900. Another edition was published in October 1904, which was reprinted in October 1906. This is the third edition.

Now, it is pleasant to see Messrs. Longmans insisting upon the distinction between a reprint and an edition, and resisting the temptation to tell us how many thousands it all comes to. For even this edition of 1909 is not a mere reprint, although the author tells us that he has abandoned the study of this period of history for other fields of research and has done no more now than remove one or two positive errors of fact.

To the 'Citizen's Library,' which is edited by Professor Ely of Wisconsin, and published by Messrs. Macmillan, there has been added a volume

on *The Elements of Sociology* (5s. net). The author is Mr. Frank W. Blackmar, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology and Economics in the University of Kansas. If it is possible for 'Elements' to be more or less elementary, then Professor Blackmar's volume is the most elementary of all. He expects us to know not one single thing about Sociology; a state of mental nakedness which it is not easy to appear in. But this is to be said about Professor Blackmar, that whatever we knew about Sociology at the beginning of his book, that and no more we know at the end of it. For it is all broken up into short hard paragraphs, not one of which is long enough or human enough to give us any understanding. There is nothing, for example, that would be of more practical value to us, or of more present interest, than some workable and illuminating 'principles of scientific Charity.' That is the title of one of the paragraphs. But what does the paragraph contain? These principles: 'The helpless must be taught to help themselves; the work test should be applied to all persons to the extent of their working power; indiscriminate giving is dangerous and should be prohibited; every gift should be for the purpose of permanently helping the recipients; and, finally, scientific charity is a study of how to relieve and how to reform.'

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published a cheap uniform edition of Dr. Arthur T. Pierson's works, seven volumes in all. They are in stiff paper covers at the uniform price of 1s. net. The paper and printing are the same as in the dearer editions. Their titles are: *The Heights, Hopes, and Heart of the Gospel*, *The Coming of the Lord*, *Evangelical Work*, *The Divine Art of Preaching*, and *Papers for Thinking People*.

A book has just been published which, for those who read it, will spoil the point of one of Dickens' most humorous character sketches. Dickens found the dissenting preacher whom he satirizes so mercilessly in *Pickwick*, in the Christian Community. Now the history of the Christian Community has just been written, and it is evident that there never was a Stiggins in it throughout all its history.

The Christian Community is a society which was formed in 1685 for Christian service among the weavers, mostly Huguenot refugees, in Spitalfields and Bethnal Green. Matthew Arnold had his sympathetic limitations as well as Dickens, but he did not make the mistake that Dickens made about the members of the Christian Community. It was one of them he met one August when the fierce sun overhead smote on the squalid street of Bethnal Green. It was Dr. Tyler, whose strong aristocratic face looks out of the frontispiece of this book. The poem comes with new interest. Let us quote it, for all its familiarity. But let us notice before doing so that *The Story of the Christian Community* is told by Mr. Edward C. Rayner, and the book is published at the Memorial Hall, London Street, Bethnal Green.

'Twas August, and the fierce sun overhead
Smote on the squalid street of Bethnal Green,
And the pale weaver, through his window seen
In Spitalfields, looks thrice dispirited.

I met a preacher there I knew, and said,
'Ill and o'erworked, how fare you in this scene?'
'Bravely!' said he, 'for I of late have been
Much cheered by thought of Christ, the living Bread.'

O human soul! as long as thou canst so
Set up a mark of everlasting light,
Above the howling senses' ebb and flow,

To cheer thee, and to right thee if thou roam,
Not with lost toil thou labourest through the night,
Thou mak'st the heaven thou hop'st indeed thy home!

Mr. R. S. Latimer (name of good omen) has written a book which gives a history of the effort to obtain liberty of conscience in Russia during the last fifty years. The title is *Under Three Tsars* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). At the beginning of one of the chapters stand the words 'How long, O Lord, how long?' They echo through the book. And yet who will blame the rulers whose sad faces encounter the reader as he turns the pages, faces more than serious, fearful with a hereditary sadness? It is a book of intense interest to the passionate follower of Christ. To the merely scientific observer there is food for thought in the intense religiousness of the Russian people, in their earnest determination to give God the first word in every act and event of their life.

'There is no more urgent problem in the whole range of Christian doctrine than the need to restate the teaching on the Person and Work of God the Holy Ghost, which is assailed both from

Unitarian and Binitarian points of view.' So says Dr. A. E. Burn in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July as he reviews two recent books by Nösgen, with which he is disappointed. Nösgen's books were issued in 1905 and 1907. Since then there have been books not a few on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The very latest is entitled *Christ Invisible Our Gain* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d.), written by the Rev. A. H. Drysdale, D.D.

As Dr. Drysdale's title is not a mere catch-penny, no one will look in his book for a complete statement of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Drysdale is a preacher, and his purpose is practical. Much of the book is occupied with the absence of Christ. He finds great value in Christ's absence —unspeakable gain in His very invisibility. But the absence of Christ is the presence of the Holy Spirit. And among the practical points which Dr. Drysdale impresses upon us regarding the presence of the Holy Spirit is this, that when Christ's work was finished, the Holy Spirit was put in possession for the first time of the most perfect instrument for spiritual service. That instrument was the cross of Christ. For 'the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.' But the Holy Spirit has never been able to use that blessed truth in the conversion of the world as He has used the truth that Christ 'died for our sins, and rose again.'

Under the title of 'The Church Universal,' Messrs. Rivingtons have for some time been publishing small volumes of introduction to the study of Church History. They have now issued Volume I. of the series, entitled *The Church of the Apostles* (4s. 6d. net). This volume has been written by the Rev. Lonsdale Ragg, B.D., Prebendary of Lincoln.

It is a volume, as it seems to us, that is well fitted to take its place in a series of more than average excellence, and even the first place. Mr. Ragg's scholarship is up to date. He explains the phrase in Ac 14^{13}, 'Jupiter, which was before their city' as simply 'Zeus Propoleos,' and refers to Ramsay's article on Lystra in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. But his scholarship is taken up into his imagination, and sometimes the writing becomes finely eloquent. He describes the effect of Stephen's dying prayer upon a certain young man who was present among those who did him to death. 'Saul never forgot that scene, that angel-face, "and when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed," he sobs, "I also was standing by and kept the raiment of them that slew him." Thus for months—it may be years—after the deed was done, the scene shone clear before his eyes, and there rang in his ears the echo of that last cry. He proclaimed himself the disciple of his earliest victim, and the slave of that victim's Lord.'

The only criticism that seems called for is that Mr. Ragg makes rather more of outward organization and rather less of inward life than one should make who is thoroughly in touch with the Church of the Apostles. In doing so he is somewhat out of touch also with the most promising thought of his own day.

'And let me tell you, strange as it may appear —even paradoxical perhaps—that just in proportion as the supernatural, the superhuman, has faded away out of my thought of Jesus, and he has become in my thought simple, natural, unmiraculous, largely subject to heredity and environment like all of us, human in his hopes and fears, human in his efforts and no doubt his errors, human in his faith and trust, human in his disappointments and in his final seeming failure—so much the more my heart has clung to him, the more he has drawn my love and veneration, the more I have longed to be like him, the more I have trusted what he has to tell me of the Father and his love, the more he has become a real and living influence in my life, a power capable of touching me to holier mood and to braver effort.'

This sentence is taken from the first essay in a volume entitled, *The Place of Jesus in Modern Religion* (Unitarian Association; 2s. net). The first essay in the volume was written by the late Rev. R. A. Armstrong, B.A. And how touching is this confession of contentment with things seen and with the meat that perisheth; of contentment growing more contented, as the Kingdom of Heaven passes more out of sight. But the Jesus who is only human is not human.

Among the fundamental things in religion with which men are now almost exclusively occupying themselves is *The Genesis of Evolution of the Individual Soul*. The Rev. J. O. Bevan, M.A., F.G.S., F.S.A., has treated the subject scientifically in a little book published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate.

Mr. A. W. Greenup, of St. John's Hall, High-

bury, has edited *The Yalkut of R. Machir bar Abba Mari on Zechariah* (4s. net). Who was Rabbi Machir bar Abba Mari? We know nothing about him but what he tells us himself. And all he tells us himself is about his ancestors. His Yalkut, however, which covers a large part of the Old Testament, and may once have covered it all, was written probably in the fourteenth century. Mr. Greenup has already edited the Yalkut on Hosea.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament.

A. van Hoonacker, *De Arameesche Papyrusoorkonden van Elefantine* (Belfort).

P. Joüon, *Le Cantique des Cantiques* (Paris: Beauchesne. Fr.5). A philological and exegetical commentary. Professor Joüon adopts the allegorical interpretation. It is a song of the loves of Jehovah and Israel.

M. Jugie, *Histoire du Canon de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise Grecque et l'Eglise Russe* (Paris: Beauchesne. Fr.1.50).

J. Wilhelm Rothstein, *Grundzüge des Hebraïschen Rhythmus und Seiner Formenbildung nebst Lyrischen Texten mit Kritischen Kommentar* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.12.40). In this handsome volume the Professor of Theology in the University of Halle-Wittenberg brings his difficult subject up to date.

A. Socin, *Arabische Grammatik*, 6th edition, edited by Karl Brockelmann (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard. M.7).

Carl Steuernagel, *Hebraïsche Grammatik*, 3rd and 4th improved edition (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard. M.3.50). These are the most recent editions of two works belonging to the Porta Linguarum Orientalium, which have been adopted as text-books in this country.

Paul Torge, *Seelenglaube und Unsterblichkeitshoffnung im Alten Testament* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.5).

Hugo Winckler, *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*, 3rd edition, revised, with an Introduction (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.3).

J. Winter and A. Wünsche, *Mechiltha: Ein tannaitischer Midrasch zu Exodus*, for the first time translated into German and explained, with 'Beiträgen' by Professor Dr. Ludwig Blau (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.11.20).

New Testament.

Lic. Dunkmann, *Kreuz und Auferstehung Jesu als Grundlagen der Heilsgemeinde* (Leipzig: Deichert. M.1.25).

Paul Fiebig, *Die Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Forschung in der Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. 50 pfennig).

Caspar René Gregory, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.10).

Religion and Ethics.

Prof. L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme: Opinions sur l'Histoire de la Dogmatique* (Paris: Beauchesne. Fr.4).

Mgr. A. le Roy, *La Religion des Primitifs* (Paris: Beauchesne. Fr.4).

Le B^{on} Carra de Vaux, *La Doctrine de l'Islam*, (Paris: Beauchesne. Fr.4).

These are the first three volumes of a new series entitled 'Studies in the History of Religions.' Each volume is written by a well-recognized authority. Professor Poussin and Baron de Vaux may be said to hold the very first place in their respective subjects. Bishop le Roy is not so well known as a student of primitive religion, but this book will give him his place. The volumes are illustrated.

George Foucart, *La Méthode Comparative dans l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris: Picard).

Professor Foucart's specialty is the religion of Egypt. But no one can master one religion without knowing a good deal about Religion. This is a simple and useful introduction to the comparative method of study.

L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Le Védisme* (Paris: Bloud). This little volume belongs to another new series entitled 'History of Religions.'

Paul Oltramare, *La Formule bouddhique des douze Causes* (Geneva: Georg).

Hermann Schneider, *Zwei Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte Vorderasiens* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.1.80).

Albrecht Alt, *Israel und Aegypten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.2.40).

Otto Weber, *Eduard Glasers Forschungreisen in Südarabien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M.—60).

G. Hölscher, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Palästina seit dem Jahre 70 nach Chr.* (Leipzig: Hinrichs).

P. Gillet, *L'éducation du Caractère* (Paris: Desclée. Fr.3).

Otto Willmann, *Aristoteles als Pädagog und Didaktiker* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard. M.3).

The Ideals of the Prophets.[1]

By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

'The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose.'—Is. xxxv. 1.

There can be few who are in the habit of attending a Cathedral service to whom these words are not familiar, and in whom they do not arouse exquisite and delicious memories. Two great tone-poets, who have enriched the devotional music of the Anglican Church with some of its choicest gems, have vied with one another in the effort to express in worthy melody the noble and beautiful prophecy of which this is the opening verse: in dignified and impressive tones they have depicted the sudden change in the aspect of the barren soil; the waters breaking forth in the wilderness, and the streams in the desert; the doubts and fears of the exiled Israelites giving place to buoyancy and joy; the happiness of those privileged to mount triumphantly on the highway leading to their home; the rapture of sacred delight filling their breasts as they enter with singing into Zion, and are conscious that the supreme goal of human happiness has been reached by them, that sorrow and sighing have fled away, and that the discords jarring in the present have at last been resolved in the sweet and inexpressible harmony of the future. So long as the human soul remains susceptible to the emotions aroused by music, so long as music retains its magic power of winning entrance to the heart for true and noble thoughts, so long, we may be sure, the names of Wesley and Goss will be inseparably conjoined with the prophecy which now stands as the 35th chapter of the book which bears Isaiah's name.

What, however, may we learn from the prophecy, when we regard it in its context and original significance? It is connected intimately with the 34th chapter, and forms its counterpart and sequel. The prophecy in the 34th chapter is directed against Edom, the near neighbour of Judah, but also its great rival, between which and Judah there prevailed a spirit of inveterate ill-feeling and jealousy, leading to frequent and bitter hostilities. The day of triumph for Edom was when Jerusalem was entered, and the temple destroyed, by the Chaldæans under Nebuchadnezzar: Ezekiel and Obadiah[2] alike bear witness to the malicious exultation which the Edomites then expressed: they laid in wait to plunder and intercept the fugitives; they watched eagerly as the victorious Chaldæans broke down the walls; as a Psalmist, writing long after, has not forgotten, they even urged on the work of destruction, saying:

> Down with it, down with it, even to the ground![3]

The 34th and 35th chapters of Isaiah form one of those prophecies which, though incorporated in the Book of Isaiah, are not by Isaiah himself. The 34th chapter was written while resentment for this unfeeling behaviour of the Edomites was still keenly felt by the Jews. It consists of a long and impressive denunciation of the judgment impending on Edom: the prophet describes the carnage and destruction of which its country, he imagines, will shortly be the scene; its mountain stronghold will be laid desolate; its land will be buried under streams of molten lava; its castles and fortresses will become the resort of desert creatures, which will haunt its ruins for ever.

To the desolation and abandonment thus anticipated for Edom, the picture in chap. 35 forms a striking and finely conceived contrast. For the Israelites, now at last to be delivered from their years of exile in Babylon, the wilderness and the parched land will rejoice, and the desert burst forth into a brilliant and abundant bloom. The wilderness meant is the broad arid expanse lying between Babylon and Palestine, which the exiles journeying homewards would naturally have to traverse. Jehovah is returning with His long-exiled nation; and the way by which He will pass must be worthily prepared for the progress of the Great King: the desert must be transformed into a paradise for the delectation of His people; avenues of stately trees must cast their shade about them: 'the glory of Lebanon shall be given

[1] A sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ, Oxford, on the first Sunday after Trinity, 1908.

[2] Ez 25^{12} $35^{5.\ 10.\ 12f.}$, Ob $^{10-14}$.

[3] Ps 137^{7} (Prayer-Book Version).

unto it, the majesty of Carmel and Sharon'—those richly-forested districts of Palestine—'*they* shall see the glory of the Lord, the majesty of our God.'

'Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not': let those among the exiles who are fearful and timorous, and who doubt whether their release is near at hand, take courage: 'Behold, your God will come with vengeance; *he* will come and save you.' Then human infirmities will cease to vex, and nature will co-operate spontaneously in the relief of human needs: 'then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert,' yielding cool and near refreshment for the returning exiles: the glowing sand or mirage, which so often in Eastern countries deludes with false hopes the exhausted traveller, will become a real lake, and the thirsty land will send forth springs of water. 'And an highway shall be there, and a way; and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it, but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein.' The prophet imagines in the desert a raised way leading from Babylon to Zion: only those who are worthy, those who are holy and clean, will be admitted upon it: but it will be so broad and plain that even the simplest, even 'fools,' will not lose their track upon it, so elevated and well-protected that no dangerous beast will be able to climb up and molest the pilgrims journeying along it: 'No lion shall be there, nor shall any ravenous beast go up thereon, they shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there'—not, of course, the 'redeemed' in the Christian sense of the term, but, as the expression is elsewhere explained, those whom Jehovah has redeemed from their long exile in Babylon: 'and the ransomed of Jehovah shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.' The prophecy is thus, in a word, a promise of the glorious return of the Jewish exiles from Babylon, of the bountiful provision to be made for the relief of their temporal wants upon the way, and of the blessedness, spiritual and material, which will attend them when they are settled again in their ancient home.

The prophecy is not the only one in which similar representations are found. The great prophecy of Israel's restoration to Palestine, which now forms the last twenty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah and which was written approximately at the same period, abounds in similar passages. The time has come for God's ancient people to be released from its long captivity in Babylon: a crisis fraught with momentous issues for the future is at hand; and in glowing imagery the prophet pictures the progress of the returning nation under the protecting guidance of its God: 'Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of Jehovah, make plain in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the glory of Jehovah shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together. . . . I will open rivers on the bare heights, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the acacia tree, and the myrtle: I will set in the desert the fir tree, the plane, and the cypress together. . . . Go ye forth from Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldæans; with a voice of singing declare it even to the end of the earth: say ye, Jehovah hath redeemed his servant Jacob. And they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts: he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them: he clave the rock also, and the waters gushed out. . . . And I will set thy stones in fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. . . . And all thy children shall be the disciples of Jehovah; and great shall be the peace of thy children. . . . Thy people also shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land for ever.'[1]

These, and such as these, are the gorgeous and brilliant traits with which the prophets of the Exile invest the rapidly approaching future of their nation. How imperfectly those expectations were realized, history tells us. It is true, the Jews were permitted to return to their own country in the first year after Cyrus conquered Babylon; but both the circumstances of the return itself and the state of the restored community were in singular contrast with the glorious anticipations of the prophets. No avenues of umbrageous trees protected by their shade the homeward marching Israelites: no streams gushed out from the wilderness beneath their feet: when the temple and city-walls, after

[1] Is 40^{3-5} 41^{18-19} 48^{20-21} 54^{13} 60^{21}.

many hindrances and difficulties, were at last rebuilt, the splendour which the second Isaiah had promised to the restored city, the homage and respect of distant nations pressing forward with their offerings, and the expected ideal perfections,[1] which were to be the peculiar privilege of the restored community, were, one and all, conspicuous by their absence. The prophecy of Haggai, and the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, written in large measure by men living within eighty years of the return under Zerubbabel, show sufficiently how meagre the principal results of the restoration were, how depressed and dependent the state of the restored community was.

How are we to understand this painful discrepancy between the prophecy and the fulfilment? We must remember what the character of prophecy is. The prophets, in the first place, write often as poets: they give play to their imagination; they construct *ideals*. It is true, they also often deliver plain and direct utterances: they rebuke their contemporaries for their vices; they make matter-of-fact statements respecting the duty of man to his neighbour or to God; they declare, in no ambiguous language, the temporal judgments, or temporal deliverances, which they see approaching. But they often intermingle in their discourses, especially in those which deal with the future, a large *ideal* element. The imagination, which has been such a powerful factor in the education of our race, and the master-creations of which have in all ages compelled the admiration and attention of mankind, is consecrated to the service of God, and is made the vehicle of the inspiring spirit. And thus, in the pages of the prophets, coming events are idealized: imaginative pictures of a golden age of moral and material blessedness are attached to them: a present crisis is no sooner past than the ultimate goal of human history is conceived to have been reached. Isaiah, when the vexatious tyranny of the Assyrian is past, pictures an immediate revolution in the character and fortunes of his people: he pictures society as at once transformed, freed from all the faults and shortcomings which mar the present; he pictures his nation in the enjoyment of ideal felicity, and ideal spiritual and moral perfections, secure under the guardianship of its ideal King.[2] The overthrow of the hosts of Assyria is the crucial turning-point in the history of his people: when that is accomplished, the golden age begins. And so the prophets of the Exile idealize the coming restoration to Palestine: that with them is the crucial moment of history; and they depict it in more gorgeous colours than even Isaiah had ventured to employ.

How, then, are these prophecies to be interpreted? The prophets, it cannot be doubted, like other men, mean what they say: they believed that the pictures which they drew would be realized as they drew them. The only exceptions are cases in which it may be reasonably supposed that they are using figurative language, as when Isaiah, for example, describes the overthrow of the Assyrian army in imagery which obviously cannot be intended by him to be understood literally.[3] But there are cases in which the prophets' whole conception of the future is such that it cannot reasonably be supposed to have been intended figuratively; and still it contains traits which have not been fulfilled in the past, and are of such a nature that they cannot be fulfilled in the future. I say, cannot be fulfilled in the future: because the historical conditions with which alone these traits could be consistent, and under which alone they could be intelligible, have passed away; and whatever the future course of history may be, can never be reproduced. Tyre was long ago destroyed: and its people have perished, without ever, as Isaiah anticipated, consecrating their gains to the service of the true God.[4] The great nation of Assyria has also passed away: but it never, as the same prophet likewise expected that it would do, shared with Israel its high theocratic privileges, or consorted with Israel and Egypt in the friendly worship of Jehovah.[5] And it is contrary to the most fundamental principles of the Gospel to suppose that Israel should ever become, as the great prophet of the Exile pictured that it would become, the priestly caste, with the Gentiles standing towards it in the subordinate position of laity, or that Jerusalem should become the actual and visible religious centre of the world, to be visited, week by week, and month by month, by pilgrims from all nations, to observe the Jewish feasts of the Sabbath and the new moon.[6] Large parts of Is 40–60 are prophecies of this kind. They plainly describe what the prophet conceives is to follow immediately after the return to Pales-

[1] Is $60^{3-7.\ 10-12.\ 14-16.\ 18.\ 21}$.

[2] Is $29^{17-19.\ 23.\ 24}$ 30^{19-26} $32^{1-8.\ 16-18}$ $33^{5.\ 6.\ 20-24}$ 11^{1-9}.

[3] *E.g.* Is $10^{16.\ 17}$ 29^{6} $30^{27.\ 28.\ 30.\ 33}$.

[4] Is 23^{18}.

[5] Is 19^{23-25}.

[6] Is 61^{6} 66^{23}.

tine: they cannot reasonably be regarded as intended figuratively: and they unquestionably have not been fulfilled.

Nor can the difficulty be overcome by the exegetical expedient of spiritualizing the imagery of such prophecies so as to make them predictions, in disguise, of Christianity. The language used is too plain to permit that. The Israelites are to be delivered not from the stronghold of sin and Satan, but from Babylon; and their deliverer is not the Saviour of the world, but the Persian monarch, Cyrus. We must take prophecy as we find it: we must not, prior to any inductive study of what the contents and character of the prophecies actually are, assume that every description of the future which they contain must tally necessarily with the event, and be surprised and disappointed if we find that it does not do so; nor must we unduly strain the language for the purpose of bringing the two into agreement. The prophet is much more than a mere fore-teller: he is in a far wider sense the interpreter of the thoughts of God, the announcer to man of the Divine will and plan. He is not the less a true prophet because the picture of the future which he draws is sometimes a Divine ideal, rather than the reality which history actually brings with it. The ideals of the prophets display astonishing brilliancy and imaginative power. They stand before us, to kindle our admiration, to ennoble our aspirations, to stir our emulation. In no part of the Old Testament is the elevating and ennobling influence of the Spirit more manifest than in the great ideals of the prophets. But they must be read, and interpreted, *as* ideals: the imaginative garb in which the prophets' thoughts and aspirations are set forth must be recognized as such, and not regarded as necessarily, in all its details, a prediction of the future. And although such prophecies cannot, without doing violence to words, be understood even as disguised, or figurative, descriptions of the blessings of the Gospel, yet they do embody ideas which are appropriated, and find their fuller realization, in the Gospel: they depict states of ideal blessedness, which, though they are not, and are not intended to be, identical with the blessings conferred by Christianity, may still be regarded as emblems, suited to the ages to which they were addressed, of the blessedness which it is the ideal aim of the Gospel to secure, partly upon earth, more completely hereafter in heaven. The felicity which the prophet of the Exile imagined would be the immediate consequence of the restoration to Palestine, may be viewed as an ideal, setting forth in warm and glowing colours God's purposes of grace towards His faithful people, and the blessedness which He has in store for them, and at the same time serving as a fore-gleam, or prelude, of that wider and larger salvation, which He offers to all men in Christ. Unto which, in His mercy, may He vouchsafe to bring us, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

In the Study.

A Study in Illustration.

Here is a man who believes that the highest reach of art in the preparation of the sermon is the art of illustrating it. And if rarity is an evidence of high attainment he must be nearly right. The title of Mr. Edwards' book is *The Art of Illustration illustrated* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net).

It is quite clear that Mr. Edwards has given some time to the study of the art. And he has learned to practise it. His introduction contains good principles, illumined by good examples. He has also read liberally among the artists of illustrations.

And yet, for all that, one can see that he has only skimmed the surface of his subject. He has a section on the Rev. William L. Watkinson, Ex-President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, as an illustrator. We could undertake to find more illustrations, and better, in a single sermon of Mr. Watkinson's than he has found in all his writings.

Take a sermon from his latest book, *Themes for Hours of Meditation*, and let it be the sermon on

'The Claim of the Outsider.' The text is Col 4^5, 'Walk in wisdom toward them that are without.'

The divisions of the sermon are simple, almost inevitable—I. The Distinction here assumed: 'them that are without' implies 'them that are within.' II. The Duty of the Within to the Without.

In the Distinction itself Mr. Watkinson deals first with the *reality* of it, next with the *determination* of it, and then with the *significance* of it. Under the *reality* he points out that though men dislike the distinction of sheep and goats, wheat and tares, it occupies the New Testament, and it can be seen in life itself. 'We obey one law: the higher law of the mind, or the lower of the flesh. The antagonism between France and Germany is emphatic and the frontier is exactly defined—a clear line of demarcation not to be crossed with impunity.' That is the first illustration. The *determination* of the distinction, he says, is made by Christ. But there is no illustration here except the Biblical one: 'To be within is to be in Him. He spake of the temple of His body. *He* is the true Church.' Under the *significance*, he says: 'We are exhorted in some quarters to judge Christ as we should another man, to judge the Bible as we should another book, the Church as we should any other institution; but we cannot thus understand the faith of Christ. We do not know the glory of a garden by a glimpse through the hedge, the glory of a cathedral by walking about it and looking up at its dark windows, or the glory of a country by sailing round its shores; the garden, shrine, or country must be judged from within, and from within must we judge the Lord Jesus and all that pertains to His faith and service.' And 'to be without,' he says a little later, 'is to be outside the ark, struggling with the deluge.'

The second division is the Duty of the Within to the Without. Mr. Watkinson sums up the whole duty in this, that we must maintain *high character*. And very soon we reach this illustration: 'Years ago we read a work on Alpine flowers which was vividly written and brilliantly illustrated; yet when we saw those very flowers in blue, gold, and crimson growing on the mountains we better understood their true glory.'

He points out that the Apostle's word is not *talk* in wisdom, but *walk* in wisdom. 'The sun needs no syllables to assure us that it shines; a letter of commendation is not necessary with the evening star; the blue sky requires no dictionary to explain itself; no elocution is desirable to set forth the purity and grandeur of the sea; and the purple patch on the mountain side, the golden gorse on the heath, the red rose of the garden, persuade us of their lustre and sweetness without any tricks of rhetoric.' Here is a very riot of illustration, but it is the riot of nature, which is the highest art.

Then he touches on the elements of character. But first there must be symmetry and proportion. 'We often do ourselves and the cause of Christ great injustice by faults of temper and life which lessen our influence. As every one knows, the famous Church of St. Peter at Rome was not completed according to the original plan of Michael Angelo; a later builder put up the façade in another order of architecture, in consequence of which the grand dome that Angelo fixed in the golden air is largely concealed, and the splendid proportions of the structure are not adequately realized.'

The elements of character he touches are all for avoidance. The first is *rigidness*. Rigidness is not conscientiousness; it is the insistence upon hard-and-fast rules which are chiefly gratuitous. 'The artists tell us that Nature abhors the straight line, that the curve is the line of beauty; and it is thus in morals. There are Christians who are so fond of straight lines that they would square the sun and flatten the rainbow.' The next is *roughness*. Mr. Watkinson rarely makes use of an anecdote, but the rare use is the right use. 'At a meeting for Christian fellowship,' he says, 'we heard a brother deplore that he found himself lacking in that perfect courtesy which ought to distinguish the Christian.' It is the only occasion upon which Mr. Watkinson has heard this grace referred to in a meeting. But he has heard men say, 'I do not care for smoothness and suavity: I believe in reality and outspokenness.' 'What!' he exclaims, 'is not silk as real as sandpaper, and is it not infinitely more effective?' The third is *hardness*. Hard people remind him of a tuning-fork; 'they are genuine enough, and you get from them a true note in a steely fashion, yet no one will mistake the sound for music, or care to die for such an instrument.' The last is *gloominess*. And here Mr. Watkinson gives us a quotation, effective also on account of its rarity. It is from R. L. Stevenson: 'I do not call that by the name of

religion which fills a man with bile.' Then comes that most difficult of all the accessories to a great sermon, the touch of humour. 'We remember seeing a South African journal which contained an advertisement for a lady help: "A Christian preferred; cheerful, if possible." So it has come to that!'

But character is combination of characteristics. And the sermon ends with a quotation from the diary of Andrew Bonar: 'In prayer in the wood for some time, having set apart three hours for devotion; felt drawn out much to pray for that peculiar fragrance which believers have about them who are very much in fellowship with God. It is like an aroma, unseen but felt. Other Christians have the beauty of the Rose of Sharon; these have the fragrance too.'

A Study in Old English.

What does the uneducated Englishman make of the phrase, 'Woe worth the day!' in Ezk 30^2? The Scotsman understands it instinctively; for it is used freely in Scots to this day. But how many Englishmen catch the meaning of it as they read; or how many of them have it explained from the pulpit?

It comes from Coverdale. It was accepted by Cranmer and the Bishops, and so passed into the Authorized Version and is retained by the Revisers. Even Toy in the Polychrome Bible keeps the Authorized phrase, although he begins his introduction by saying: 'The present rendering of the Old Testament is not a revision of the Authorized Version, but a new translation from the Hebrew in Modern English.'

The Hebrew is הָהּ לַיּוֹם, *hah layyom*; the Greek Ὢ ὡήμέρα; the Latin 'vae, vae, diei.' From the Vulgate comes Wyclif's 'Woo! woo! to the dai'; and the Douai, 'wo, wo to the day.' The same exclamation in the Hebrew in Joel 1^{15} was rendered by Coverdale, 'Alas, alas for this daye,' and has come through all the later Versions in the form 'Alas for the day!' except the Douai, which has the singular expression, 'A a a, for the day,' following literally, as Wyclif had already done, the Vulgate, 'A a a, diei.'

'Worth' as a verb meant in Old English to *become* or to *be*. In the *Legends of the Saints* (ed. W. M. Metcalfe, Scot. Text Soc., ii. 11) it is said of St. Machor that

> Growand ay furth he wes
> In vertu and in gudnes,
> And for he doutyt for to fal,
> Til abstinens he gef hym al,
> And held his flesch undirlout,
> For dred it suld worth stout
> A-gane the saul.

It is still in use in modern Scots. Hogg (*Tales*, 1838) says, 'I was . . . considering what could be wort of a' the sheep.'

Accordingly, 'woe worth the day' means 'evil happen to the day.' Blind Harry has the phrase in *Schir William Wallace* (ed. J. Moir, Scot. Text Soc., iv. 744)—

> Than wepyt scho, and said full oft, 'Allace
> That I was maide, wa worthe the coursit cas!

Spenser has 'Woe worth the man,' in the *Faerie Queene*, vi. xxxii. 7—

> Wo worth the man,
> That first did teach the cursed steele to bight
> In his owne flesh, and make way to the living spright.

And Chaucer, in *Troilus and Criseyde*, ii. 345, uses the phrase four times in successive lines—

> Wo worth the faire gemme vertulees!
> Wo worth that herbe also that dooth no bote!
> Wo worth that beautee that is routhelees!
> Wo worth that wight that tret ech under fote!

The Law of Purification in Mark vii. 1–23.[1]

By the Rabbi A. Büchler, Ph.D., Principal of the Jews' College, London.

The difficulties in Mark's report of the incident of the washing of the hands before eating bread, and in his remarks on the Jewish laws of purification, are so well known that it is hardly necessary to enumerate them. On the other hand, the explanations of the passage offered by commentators are either unsatisfactory or do not do justice to the rules of purification as preserved in the early Jewish literature. In most cases the commentaries give criticisms of the

[1] Lecture read before the Cambridge Theological Society on May 13th.

Jewish law instead of trying to understand them; for the rules, though not very involved, are yet such as fail to attract sympathy. Yet only information derived directly from the Talmudic sources about the laws of purification can afford the clue to the puzzles of Mark's long, but incomplete report.

1. The Composition of Mark 7^{1-23}.

This chapter falls into four parts: 1. The statement of the Pharisees that some of Jesus' disciples neglected the usage of washing before meals, and their reproach (vv.[1. 2. 5]), interrupted by Mark's explanation of (*a*) the custom of washing the hands before a meal, and (*b*) of another custom of purification before eating, consisting in bathing (vv.[3. 4]), and (*c*) of dipping vessels (v.[4]). The addition of *b* and *c* was not required as explanation of the incident, but is due to v.[8b] (see below). In part two (vv.[6-8]) Jesus returns the reproach instead of giving an answer, and says that the Pharisees lay aside the commandment of God and hold the tradition of men, and he refers to Is 29^{13}. In the third part (vv.[9-13]) Jesus gives the instance of vows in which the observance of the tradition supersedes a Biblical law. In part four Jesus explains first to the people, and afterwards more fully to His disciples, that food which according to the Pharisees defiled man, in fact defiled nobody, but that only wrong actions defiled.

Now part two, Jesus' reproach, strangely refers to the washing of pots and cups, as though the instance by which Jesus is about to illustrate His general reproach of the neglect of the Pharisees, were concerned with washing vessels or furniture. This is all the more strange, as in His following speeches to the people and to the disciples, Jesus only deals with food that defiles man, but makes no reference to vessels, although food could be defiled either by hands levitically unclean or by impure vessels. In addition to this, Jesus did not explain which commandment of God, in His view, the Pharisees neglected on account of washing the hands before meals. The third difficulty in this reproach is the supposition that unwashed hands could defile food to such a degree that the food could in its turn defile the body of him who ate it. Such a degree of uncleanness of unwashed hands is contrary to rabbinical law. Even more difficult is Mark's statement that the Jews, when coming from the market, had to bathe before eating. All efforts to prove this a custom, even of the strictest Jew, must fail. No rule at all similar is preserved in the vast rabbinical code of clean and unclean, or can be derived from any of its minute prescriptions about levitical purity. There seems to me to be only one possible way of explaining all this which is not forced, namely, that the reproaches and statements refer to priests, Aaronites. This granted, every detail is borne out by rabbinical law in the Talmudic literature.

2. The parallel in Mt 15^{1-20} shows the same divisions: (1) The reproach of the Pharisees (vv.[1. 2]); (2) Jesus' stricture on the Pharisees that they transgress God's commandments because of their tradition (v.[3]); (3) the instance of this (vv.[4-6]) and after it the reference to Is 29^{13}; and (4) the statement to the people (vv.[10. 11]) and to the disciples (vv.[12-20]), with the additional conclusion: 'These are the things which defile a man, but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.' The first difficulty in Mark's statement does not exist here, since Jesus' reproach that the Pharisees neglect God's commandments because of their tradition, refers in Matthew not to washing the hands, but to vows only; and further, there is no reference at all to the purification of vessels. Therefore it seems to be in Mark some later detail. How did it come in?

Lk 11^{37-54} knows more fully an incident that occasioned the whole discussion on the washing of the hands. A Pharisee invited Jesus to a meal, and when Jesus sat down to the meal without having bathed (ἐβαπτίσθη), his host wondered at *His* neglect.[1] Jesus' attack there on the Pharisees is not a general one, as in Mark and Matthew, but He says instead (v.[39]): 'Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. ([40]) Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without, make that which is within also? ([41]) But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and behold, all things are clean unto you.' The difficulties of this answer may be best looked up in the commentaries. As the reply stands at present, the meaning seems to be: You clean the vessel, the body, outside, but inside it is full of

[1] It is more probable that the original report related the attack of the Pharisees to have been directed against Jesus, and that Matthew and Mark from respect for Jesus substituted the disciples, and not *vice versa*.

dishonesty and injustice. But the corresponding passage in Mt 23^{25} runs: 'For ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. (^{26}) Blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and the platter, that the outside of them may be clean also.'[1] It is extremely difficult to see what it was that suggested to Jesus the reference to cleansing vessels. If He meant to say: You wash your hands, in order to keep the vessel clean, it would have been all well; but there is in the description of the incident and of the meal no reference to vessels, and, as a matter of fact, there were no vessels to mention, since the bread was eaten with the hands. We would have to assume that when sitting down to the table, Jesus noticed that some vessels were just being purified for some momentary use at the meal, and that this gave Him the occasion for His remark on the vessels. His reproach, caused by the criticism of the Pharisee, must therefore have originally included two points, the washing of the hands and the purification of vessels, as is suggested by Matthew's report. Matthew and Luke reported from their source one of the reproaches, namely, that on the vessels; Mark, from his, reported the other, namely, that on the hands. Mark's editor wanted to be complete, and for this purpose inserted in his source the reproach contained in the other source. This made it then necessary that Jesus should refer to the cleansing of pots and cups, and for that Mark had to explain to his readers not only the custom of washing the hands before a meal, but also that of dipping vessels for purification. His reference to the bathing or sprinkling of the body on coming from the market suggests that he knew a third report in which Jesus reproached the Pharisees for their bathing when coming from the market. The commandment of God which the Pharisees neglected on account of their purifications was, according to Matthew and Luke, that which forbids rapacity and excess. The editor of Mark probably intended to insert this too, and for this purpose arranged the sentences of his separate sources in such a way as to obtain room for this insertion; but ultimately forgot to add the few words on the dishonesty of the Pharisees.

3. Now, as to the actual conditions underlying the severe strictures of rapacity, apart from the fact that Luke clearly distinguishes between scholar and Pharisee, the rabbis, as far as I know their poor conditions and their wretched lives, had no opportunity for exhibiting rapacity and excess. It can only have been the wealthy landowner or merchant who happened to be a Pharisee, and who, by his dealings with the poorer class, incurred the reproach pronounced by Jesus. Their ways were not strictly honest, and were in other respects open to blame, and they did not give them up when nominally and outwardly they joined the ranks of the Pharisees. They seem, according to the passages quoted, to have undertaken two things of the law especially: to give all tithes and priestly dues properly, and besides this to observe some of the laws of levitical purity. For in Lk 11^{42} Jesus on the same occasion, when He blamed the Pharisee with whom He dined, reproached the Pharisees generally that they tithed even herbs but neglected judgment and the love of God (in Mt 23^{23} judgment, mercy, and faith). It is quite possible, as it is suggested by some commentaries, that this passage is merely a collection of various reproaches once separate, but now ascribed to one occasion; and in support of this it may be noticed that Matthew connects the same attack with another occasion. But if in point of fact an actual occurrence does underlie this report, then it must be assumed that the Pharisee carefully tithed the food in the presence of Jesus. Or he may have said to Jesus that He or His disciples ought to have washed their hands for the bread, and all the more so as it was made of corn properly tithed and prepared in strict levitical purity. And it must be added that Pharisees deserving such scathing strictures were not the rule, since the wealthy Pharisee in Lk 18^{11} could boast of not being as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. He is not represented as an exception among the Pharisees, nor did Jesus question that the Pharisee was justified in stating this.

2. The Laws of Purification.

1. Mark states three rules of levitical purification as generally observed by all Jews: (1) Washing the hands before meals; (2) sprinkling or bathing when coming from the market; (3) washing cups, wooden and brazen vessels, and beds.[2] It is strange

[1] See Wellhausen on Lk 11^{39}.

[2] The last word is omitted in some manuscripts.

that in the case of the vessels Mark failed to mention the occasion on which the washing had to be done; but from the references in the first two points it can be inferred that besides the ordinary purification dipping had to be applied to a vessel before its use at a meal. The commentaries refer to Edersheim, 'who shows that the Jewish ordinance required immersions (*βαπτισμούς*) of the vessels.' What vessels and in what case, is not explained; obviously the commentators assume that every vessel in every case had to be immersed before being used. Edersheim[1] gives eight lines on the purification of vessels, and the information which they afford is poor and misleading. I know only of two occasions when vessels of a lay Israelite had to be purified: either when they have been obtained from a non-Jew, even if he had not used them,[2] or when actually defiled by a levitical impurity.[3] But the context in Mark does not suggest that the vessels have just been bought in the market from a non-Jew, nor that they had been defiled in some way or other, but Mark states the purification as a usual procedure recurring frequently in the house of a Pharisee. And if the word *κλινῶν* is correct, even a part of the furniture would have been included in the frequent purifications which, in spite of the repeated assertions of most of the commentators of the passage in Mark and of recent historians of the period, was never in vogue among non-priests.

2. The form in which Mt 23^{25} and Lk 11^{39} present the same reproach of Jesus against the Pharisees, only enhances the difficulty; for both speak of the cleansing of the outside of vessels, and no mention is made of immersing them. Here, again, I am unable to find any clear case in which a vessel had levitically to be purified outside and not at the same time inside, except when levitically unclean liquids caused a lighter defilement of a vessel of wood or of metal.[4] Although the principle of distinguishing between the outside and the inside of the vessel in reference to levitical defilement can be traced to R. Gamaliel I., the contemporary of Jesus,[5] and followed up from that time onwards,[6] it is expressly stated that such impurity applied to priestly due only as opposed to holy things;[7] in no case did it apply to the ordinary food of even the strictest lay Jew. It is true that a Baraitha, quoted by R. Bibi in the Babylonian schools of the fourth century, deals with the distinction mentioned in reference to holy things of the temple, as well as to holy things in the provinces, and R. Bibi interpreted the second point to refer to food of a lay Jew, handled by him as a thing of the levitical purity of holy things.[8] Consequently Matthew and Luke's report could be understood as referring to vessels of lay Jews. But even if this passage were of an earlier date than it actually is, it would show that only the vessels of such lay persons as observed the highest degree of purity in their food, were liable to be defiled outside and not at the same time inside, and only food of that purity could be defiled by such vessels. It accordingly must refer to priests or lay Jews during their stay in Jerusalem for the purpose of partaking of sacrificial meals, or those priests and those very few laymen in the provinces who kept their food in the highest degree of purity. Since Matthew and Luke make Jesus refer to such purification as an everyday occurrence, there is only one way of explaining it, namely, that Jesus described the procedure observed by priests and not by laymen.

The wooden and brazen vessels and beds which Mark enumerates, when defiled by an unclean liquid, required purification from outside only; when defiled by an impurity of a higher degree, they had to be immersed. But such purifications were required only in the case of priests, for their meals of priestly dues or of ordinary food kept in the same degree of purity. And we must therefore assume that Jesus entered the house of an Aaronite, and saw how diligently and carefully the vessels and the beds to be used at the meal were cleansed from the outside only. Of course, vessels and beds were usually clean and pure; but the doubt lest

[1] *The Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 9–15.

[2] 'Aboda Zara v. 12 and the Baraitha in b. 'Aboda Zara 75^{b}, Sifrê Num 158, Sifrê Zuta in *Jew. Quart. Review*, vi. 657 ff.

[3] See, for instance, Beṣa ii. 2, 3, and the Baraithas in b. Beṣa 18^{a}, 19^{a}.

[4] Kelim xxv. 6: a vessel the exterior of which has been defiled by liquids, its exterior only is defiled, but its inside and all its handles are pure. If its inside is defiled, the whole vessel is unclean (Pesaḥ. 17^{b}).

[5] Baraitha in Bekhor. 38^{a}, Sifra on Lev 11, p. 53^{d} § 4.

[6] R. Tarfon and R. 'Akiba discuss it in Kelim xxv. 7, R. Eliezer and R. Joshua in Tos. Yadayim i. 8, Simon, 'Azarya's brother in i. 9, Mishna Tohar. viii. 7, anonymous scholars in Kelim xxv. 4, R. Jehuda in Pesaḥ. 17^{b}.

[7] Ḥagiga ii. 1.

[8] b. Ḥagiga 22^{b}.

some defilement even of a slight degree might possibly have reached them, necessitated the purification. Not even the average priest in Galilee observed these very minute laws, and cared little for possible defilement of slight impurity. Only priests of strict observance who cared to handle their priestly dues in levitical purity, learned and observed those rules. All the abuses advanced by Schürer instead of argument against this interpretation of the laws of levitical purifications derived from rabbinical sources, will not remove the proofs, unless a refutation from sources is offered. In conclusion it may be stated that a point similar to the purification of beds incidentally reported confirms the view just expounded. In Tos. Kelim 3 iii. 4 we read: 'If (unclean) liquids fall upon a part of a table, the whole table is defiled; if they fall upon its exterior, only its exterior is defiled. If the liquids fall upon its leg, the leg has to be wiped and it is pure. R. Jehuda said: I shall quote a practical occurrence (הלכה): the priests never refrained from putting the leg of a table upon unclean liquids, for they said, the leg has only to be wiped to become pure.' R. Jehuda, in order to illustrate the law of this impurity, expressly quoted the procedure observed by priests, but could not adduce one of Pharisaic rabbis, who certainly were stricter in their observance of laws applying to them, but did not observe such rules of levitical purification.

3. In the second part of Mark's report the texts vary between *ῥαντίσωνται* and *βαπτίσωνται*. If the first reading is correct, the statement that Jews coming from the market had to be sprinkled, is extremely difficult. Sprinkling with ashes of purification was applied to men or vessels only in case of defilement by a dead human body, brought about either by being under the same roof with, or by touching in the open air, a dead human body or a bone of it or a grave (Nu $19^{14\text{-}16}$ 31^{23}). According to rabbinical law, also a grave hidden or supposed to be hidden under the surface of the earth necessitated the purification by sprinkling. The fact that Luke in the same connexion (11^{44}) and Matthew immediately after the washing of vessels (23^{27}) compare the Pharisees to graves, would suggest that the defilement referred to in the reports underlying Matthew's and Luke's, and used by Mark's ultimate editor, was a defilement by graves. Perhaps the discussion took place in a town or village of the levitical character of Tiberias,[1] where the market was once a cemetery. However, there are also decisive objections to this interpretation. In Mark this sprinkling is represented as an everyday occurrence, and no reference is made to graves. And secondly, 'on coming from the market' is quite incorrect in reference to sprinkling, since such purification could take place only on the third and seventh days after the defilement (Nu 19^{19}), and in no case immediately on coming from the place of actual or assumed impurity. And even apart from this great difficulty sprinkling was applied to lay Jews, as a rule, only shortly before the festivals of pilgrimage, in order to purify the Jew for partaking of sacrificial meals in Jerusalem and for visiting the temple. Priests, however, who had to be pure for eating their dues, had to be cleansed whenever they had incurred the defilement by stepping on graves in the ground of the market. If, therefore, *ῥαντίσωνται* is correct, Mark can only have referred to purifications of Aaronites in a place where the market was considered to have been a cemetery. But the other objections prove *ῥαντίσωνται* untenable.

If, therefore, *βαπτίσωνται* was the original reading, the question arises whether people coming from the market actually used to bathe for levitical purification and what the occasion for such a bath was? It may be stated at once that even the strictest observance of levitical purity knows nothing in rabbinical law of such a custom. Edersheim's note on this matter is utterly baseless in which he says: 'Any contact with the heathen, even the touch of his dress, might involve such defilement that on coming from the market the orthodox Jew would have to immerse.'[2] Since he gives no references, it is difficult to say whence he derived his erroneous statements.[3] Schürer

[1] Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 2, 3, Sabb. $33^{b\text{ff.}}$, jer. Šebi'ith ix. 1.

[2] *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 9–15.

[3] Perhaps he had in mind Epiphanius' note on the Samaritan observance of purity in Hæres. ix. 3, where he reports: 'The Samaritans, on coming from abroad, purify themselves from the defilement by applying urine; when they touched a stranger or a non-Samaritan, they bathe in their garments, and they detest a dead body.' But Edersheim certainly knew that the Samaritans, owing to their living on the Mount of Gerizim and in its close neighbourhood, observed constant levitical purity, and that their laws of purity were much stricter than the rules of the rabbis. Another case for immersing after coming from the market could be when one is afraid that a non-Jew has, when speaking, spit upon him. R. Joshua b. Hananya asked his disciples after his visit at the house of a non-Jewish lady:

notes[1] the Mishna Ḥagiga ii. 5: He who is about to eat ordinary (non-holy) food or tithe or priestly dues has to wash his hands; for a sacrificial meal he has to immerse them; for the sin-offering, if his hands are defiled, his body is defiled. And to this Schürer adds: 'Bathing of the whole body before a meal cannot be found as general prescription in rabbinical literature; the interpretation of the New Testament passages is uncertain.' From this one thing can be inferred cogently: Mark's statement cannot possibly have described a practice of lay Pharisees, not even of those of the strictest observance. It cannot have referred even to Aaronites, since according to the Mishna quoted even they had to wash only their hands for eating priestly dues, not the whole body. There were no sacrificial meals in Galilee for which lay Jews would have had even to immerse the hands, nor were their sin-offerings of any kind, for which Aaronites would have had to bathe; so that there seems no way of substantiating Mark's statement that the Jews, when coming from the market, bathed. Here even the assumption does not help us, as in the case of purifying vessels, that it referred to lay Jews who observed in their food the levitical purity of sacrificial meals, for in this case only immersing the hands was required. Only if they observed in their food the levitical purity of sin-offerings, would bathing have been required. But only very few instances of laymen of such strictness are known, and those are as rare exceptions specially reported. Johanan b. Gudgeda in Ḥagiga ii. 7 a Levite, Josê b. Joëzer a very pious priest and the proselyte Akylas in Tos. Ḥagiga iii. 3 are especially mentioned, although the degree of purity which they observed was not as high as to impose upon them bathing before meals. No doubt, some very strict priests may have observed the same high purity even in Galilee in order to prepare themselves at home for the service in Jerusalem. But Mark clearly reports that the Jews bathe when coming from the market, and he does not seem to refer to exceptions of great rarity.

4. The only solution, it seems to me, is suggested by the following report, which is incidentally preserved in the Talmudic literature, and which teaches three points in the clearest possible manner: (1) Bathing because of defilement was required immediately on coming home, (2) from the market, (3) by laymen about to partake of a sacrifical meal in Jerusalem, or for Aaronites in the provinces of Palestine about to eat their priestly dues. In Tos. 'Ahiloth xviii. 21 we read: 'Rabbi, R. Ismael b. R. Josê and R. Eliezer ha Kappâr once spent a Sabbath in the shop of Pazzi in Lydda. On that occasion they asked R. Pinḥas b. Yair, who sat in front of them: What is your (school's) view about Ashkalon's position (is it a part of Palestine or abroad)? He replied: People sell wheat in their basilikas, immerse and eat in the evening their Pascha. Then they asked him: In what does it differ from abroad? He replied: In the fact that only after the non-Jew has stayed there for forty days, is the basilika considered defiling as is the case abroad.' To understand this, we must remember that owing to the suspicion that a body may be buried in the dwelling-place of a non-Jew, any Jew visiting such a house was considered defiled by a dead body and had to bathe in order to be permitted to partake the same night of the Passover meal. Since the defilement was only assumed as possible, the rabbis allowed the purifying bath to be taken immediately without any preceding sprinkling of ashes. Now in the parallel Baraitha in Jer. Shebi'ith vi. 36° 35 the report of the same incident differs in an essential point. The answer of R. Pinḥas b. Yair is this: 'We used to go down to the provision market of Ashkalon and to buy wheat, then we came up to our place, bathed, and ate our priestly dues.' Whereas in the first report R. Pinḥas related, no doubt from a reliable source, an incident of the times before the destruction of the temple; according to the parallel, the Aaronites of his own time, himself among them, required an immersion after having been in the market of Ashkalon, in order to be allowed to eat priestly due. Mark's report could therefore have referred only to Aaronites, and not to lay Jews. This only confirms the explanation given of the other details of jurisdiction in Mark. The place where he noticed the practice was a town inhabited partly by non-Jews, either Sepphoris or Tiberias or some other city of Galilee, and at the same time a place inhabited by a great number of Aaronites practising the strict rules of levitical purification.

5. Reverting now to Jesus' objection to the

When you saw me taking a bath, of what did you suspect me? They answered: We thought a stream of spittle from her mouth may have flown upon your garments. Then he said, I assure you, it was so (Confer jer. Joma i. 38^{d}; Tos. Nidda v. 3; b. 33^{a}, where the same happened to a high priest on the day of Atonement).

[1] Geschichte ii., 3rd edition, 577, note 7.

Pharisaic law of defilement, it is obvious from his words against the defilement caused by food taken in, and from his emphasis of impurity coming from within, that the Pharisees taught that unwashed hands defiled the food, and the food in turn defiled the body inside. If this inference is correct, it is contrary to early rabbinical law. The assumed impurity of unwashed hands is of a slight force, and though it can be transferred to food touched, the food defiled cannot in its turn transfer the impurity to the body of him who eats it. This rule is clearly laid down in the Mishna (Zabim v. 12), and in all the passages dealing with assumed impurity of the hands. Everywhere the technical term פוסלין is used for this impurity, which can be transferred once and no further, as opposed to מטמאין. At the same time it is stated that the impurity of the hands applies only to priestly dues.[1] And Ilfa, a rabbi of the beginning of the third century, points out (Sabb. 14b) that when this assumed impurity of the hands was first introduced by Hillel and Shammai, it was instituted to apply to priestly dues only. And the same is repeated in other Baraithas quoted in the discussion there. This, again, leads to the conclusion that Mark's statement about the defiling force of the unwashed hands applied only to Aaronites on account of their priestly dues, and not to the lay Jew and his food. And secondly, since the impurity of the hands is described as defiling food to such a degree that the food in turn defiles a man, the hands must have been not only unwashed, but also actually defiled by some real levitical impurity.[2]

In fact Mark's wording clearly confirms this inference. His source in 7^2 reported: The Pharisees saw some of Jesus' disciples eat bread κοιναῖς χερσίν, and a later editor interpreted this by τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις. Was he correct in this interpretation? Κοινός is used in this chapter several times (though only as verb κοινόω), in vv.15. 18. 20. 23, and in all these cases it means 'defile' and not 'to be unwashed.'[3] Consequently the adjective in the source must have meant the same: 'defiled hands' and not 'unwashed hands.' When the wrong interpretation was inserted in Mark's report, the usage of considering unwashed hands as defiling had developed among the Jews, and the author of that insertion simply attributed to an earlier generation the usage of his own times.

To sum up. By comparing with the earliest material about the laws and practices of levitical purification in rabbinical literature, the several details in Mark's report in chap. vii. about the different kinds of purification practised in Galilee, we arrive at the following results. The practice described by Mark can only have been that of priests, and not of lay Jews. The Pharisees in the report of Mark must have meant priests who had recently joined the ranks of the Pharisees and had adopted the strict rules of purification instituted by the rabbis for the priests in order to safeguard the levitical purity of the priestly dues. The rabbis were the authors and expounders of these laws, but they had no occasion to observe them themselves. It is due only to Mark's generalizing statement about the actual and not at all general observance of the laws of purification that scholars have formed an utterly erroneous view of the extent to which the rules of purification were observed in Galilee and in Judæa in the times of Jesus. Although this is only a very small detail of religious observance, historical truth, not measuring and not weighing the importance of facts, requires us to correct our views of the observance of the laws of purification.

[1] This rule remained unaltered even in the second century, when the school of R. Meir extended the laws of purification to laymen. For we find in Tos. Tohar. I. 6, הידים מטמאות אחד ופוסלות אחד בקודש ופוסלות את התרומה ואין ידים לחולין. רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר משום רבי מאיר הידים תחלה לקדש ושניות לתרומות . . . the hands defile with a transferable defilement when holy things of the temple are concerned, but defile with an untransferable defilement, when priestly due is concerned; the hands, however, defile no ordinary food. In a more general form in Para xi. 5: כל המעון ביאת מים מדברי סופרים מטמא את הקודש ופוסל את התרומה ומותר בחולין דברי רבי מאיר וחכמים אוסרין במעשר. In Ḥullin 33b in a Baraitha: תניא אין ידים תחלות לחולין. רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר משום רבי מאיר ידים תחלות לחולין ושניות לתרומה. Here the hands are actually defiled by some impurity of serious nature which does not at the same time defile the whole body. Such impurity of the hands according to R. Meir in R. Simon b. Eleazar's tradition applies to ordinary food. In Jer. Ḥagiga ii. 78b 18: תני רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר משום רבי מאיר, הידים תחלה לחולין ושניות לתרומה.

[2] It is very improbable that Jesus was an Aaronite; for otherwise the Pharisees would not have failed to blame Him for defiling Himself intentionally by touching a dead body or by entering a house in which a dead body lay. Then the incident about the washing of the hands happened as Luke reported it, namely, at the house of a Pharisee, who, as priest, observed the washing of the hands before meals himself and expected everybody partaking of his meal at his table to do the same.

[3] See Merx on Mark, p. 67 ff.

Contributions and Comments.

The Word 'Hate' in Luke xiv. 26.

Few people will find it credible that this passionate word was introduced by Luke or by anybody else into a saying of Jesus which had originally a less vehement form. There is no reason for regarding Lk 14^{26} as merely a traditional variant of Mt 10^{37}. In a similar saying in Jn 12^{25}, 'hate' again occurs in Jesus' lips. In the situation presented to us by Luke there is something which it may be reverently said provokes Jesus to use strong language. 'Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' Jesus was on His way to Jerusalem to die, and the attendance of great multitudes who were utterly without comprehension of Him or sympathy with Him, who were so far from being ready to die in the same cause that they could not find it in their hearts to do themselves the smallest violence for His sake, explains the passion with which He declares the conditions of discipleship. There was no passion in the crowd, but the life of Jesus is a passion throughout, and here, as He turns and faces the dead mass in which no spark of the heavenly fire has yet been kindled, it flames up in His words with startling intensity. The multitudes were taking discipleship very easily; He will drive them away rather than have them on such terms; He will make them see by any vehemence of expression that discipleship is supremely difficult. This is what He means when He speaks of 'hating' father and mother and life.

It is worth noting that whenever men are in dead earnest, the same intensity of language appears. Jesus in this context speaks of the venture of discipleship as like that of a king going to make war with another king. War inevitably produces the very temper to which this 'hate' is intelligible. One of the closest parallels to the words of Jesus I remember to have seen is in a war song of Tyrtæus (v. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, ii. p. 15):

> μηδ' ἀνδρῶν πληθὺν δειμαίνετε, μηδὲ φοβεῖσθε,
> ἰθὺς δ' εἰς προμάχους ἀσπίδ' ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω,
> ἐχθρὰν μὲν ψυχὴν θέμενος, θανάτου δὲ μελαίνας
> κῆρας ὁμῶς αὐγαῖς ἠελίοιο φίλας.

In battle a man must *count his own life his enemy* for the honour of Sparta, and the black doom of death as dear as the beams of the sun.

In the same spirit Shakespeare makes the brave young Clifford exclaim (*II. Henry VI.* v. 2. 36):

> He that is truly dedicate to war
> *Hath no self-love*; nor he that loves himself
> Hath not essentially but by circumstance
> The name of valour.

There is a curiously close parallel also in Epictetus (iii. 3. 5), so far as language goes, though it is perhaps doing no injustice to the philosopher to say that his tone is not so much that of intense moral earnestness as of cheerful logical recklessness in pointing the consequences of a principle. 'For this reason the good is preferred to every intimate relation (οἰκειότητος). I have nothing to do with my father, but with the good. Are you so hard' (σκληρός: same word as in Jn 6^{60}: this is a hard saying; who can hear it?). Hence when any conflict arises, οἴχεται καὶ πατὴρ καὶ ἀδελφὸς καὶ πατρὶς καὶ πάντα τὰ πράγματα. There is something nonchalant in the expression here: 'away goes father and brother and country and everything'; but the old man's heart would have been with Jesus, and not with the crowd.

But the best modern commentary is perhaps to be found in *Brand* (vol. iii. of Ibsen's Works, translated by W. Archer). The conflict in this case is not identical with that which Jesus has in view. It is rather as if one of the multitude were discovering for himself what discipleship involved, and wrestling in his own spirit with its terrible demand. But we must remember that Jesus spoke out of His own experience also, when He spoke of the conditions of living for God and His kingdom; so that it is not improper to say that the same tension of feeling gave birth to the same explosive utterance in the gospel and the drama.

> If Will has conquer'd in that strife,
> Then comes at length the hour of Love;
> Then it descends like a white dove,
> Bearing the olive-leaf of life:
> *But in this nerveless, slothful state,*
> *The true, the sovereign Love—is Hate!*
> Hate! Hate! O Titan's toil, to will
> That one brief easy syllable.

The last reflexion would be incongruous and

unreal in the gospel, and indeed there is not one of these literary examples, so far as the literary quality can be felt in it, which does not suffer by comparison with the absolute simplicity of the word of Jesus. It is curious to think that any one should find that word exaggerated or unreal.

JAMES DENNEY.

Glasgow.

1 John iii. 19, 20.

Καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία, ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γινώσκει πάντα.

In my note on this passage (*Tests of Life*, p. 392). I have expressed the opinion upon the exegesis which regards the second *ὅτι* as a rhetorical resumption of the first ('because if' . . . 'because, I say') that such a resumption, with so few words intervening, is intolerable, whether in Greek or in English. I am admonished, however, that what may seem intolerable is not impossible, by the discovery of a passage in Xenophon (*Anabasis*, vii. 4, 5), the construction in which is strikingly parallel to that in St. John. *ἀφιεὶς δὲ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ὁ Σεύθης εἰς τὰ ὄρη ἔλεγεν ὅτι, εἰ μὴ καταβήσονται καὶ πείσονται, ὅτι κατακάυσει καὶ τούτων τὰς κώμας καὶ τὸν σῖτον, καὶ ἀπολοῦντο τῷ λιμῷ.* Here, as in St. John, a conditional clause is inserted between the first and the second *ὅτι*, and in each instance the number of words in the clause is exactly the same. The obvious explanation of the second *ὅτι* is that which Professor Findlay gives of it in the Epistle—that it is an 'inadvertence of the author' or a 'primitive error of the copyist'; but this is somewhat discounted in Xenophon's case by the fact that the same repetition of *ὅτι*, though with a longer parenthesis, is found in *Anabasis*, v. 6, 19. Upon the repetition Pretor remarks simply that it is 'inelegant' and 'betrays a careless and inartistic style.' But inelegance is one thing, inadvertence another; and a comparison of the passages suggests to me the inquiry, whether the repetition of the *ὅτι* might not be employed both by Xenophon and by St. John for the purpose of emphasis. In Xenophon, Seuthes issues such a warning to the fugitives as to leave no room for doubt that, if they do not come down from the mountains and submit, the burning of their villages and crops will certainly follow. So in St. John may not the second *ὅτι* have the effect of strengthening the asseveration (whether we take it as a warning or as a comfort) that, whatever be the witness our own hearts bear, the final appeal is not to them—God is greater than our hearts and knoweth all things?

ROBERT LAW.

Toronto.

Which Herod?

APROPOS of the remarks in the September number on a revised estimate of 'Herod,' it may interest some readers to hear that a native Christian peasant of Uganda, seeing a missionary at a distance, ran to him and said, 'Oh, sir, please tell me which Herod killed which James!'

EUGENE STOCK.

The Stone Ages.

WILL you allow me an additional word on the Rev. Frederick Smith's *Stone Ages in North Britain and Ireland*, reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September? It is a work which, I believe, will prove epoch-making. It opens a new and wider chapter in the history of early man by extending the inquiry to the whole of the British Isles, and producing for the first time convincing evidence that both Scotland and Ireland were inhabited during the Old Stone Age. This conclusion has already been frankly accepted by many of the leading organs of public opinion in England, and the book may thus be taken as a crushing reply to those overcautious specialists who have hitherto refused even to look at the evidence here and there advanced in support of the author's thesis. Thanks to an unwearied quest of nearly forty years amid the boulder-clays, the river-drifts, the fluvial and marine deposits of North Britain, and to a less extent of Ireland, this evidence has accumulated to such an extent in Mr. Smith's hands as to fill a portly volume of nearly four hundred pages without nearly exhausting the subject.

There are instructive chapters on glacial phenomena, on primitive man in pre- and inter-glacial times, on the implements fashioned by him for hunting, warlike, and domestic purposes, on diverse forms of eoliths and palæoliths, on the overlapping of the palæolithic and neolithic social

relations, and on various other topics interesting alike to the general reader and to the serious student of the beginning and later developments of human culture. This fascinating and endlessly varied text is illuminated by a singular wealth of illustrations, all accurately reproduced from the drawings made by the author himself. Being drawn to scale, these typical specimens present a graphic picture of the almost countless artefacts collected by Mr. Smith from all parts of Scotland between Aberdeen and Berwick, and also from some districts on the Irish seaboard in the neighbourhood of Dublin.

There is, further, a valuable essay on the extinct African fauna, such as the elephant and rhinoceros, whose remains have been found in the Lothians. The object, of course, is to show that if these pliocene mammalians could range so far north, there was nothing to prevent early man from following in their wake, just as we know that he had already followed them from North Africa through Iberia, Gaul, and Britain to the Kirkwell and Creswell caves of Yorkshire and Derbyshire. To this argument no reply is possible, and the last objection to Mr. Smith's contention is thus swept away, and the title of the 'Boucher de Perthes of Scotland,' claimed for him in the Introduction, remains unchallenged. A. H. KEANE.

London.

ἐπιούσιος in Hebrew and Aramaic.

IN the article 'Lord's Prayer,' I. (*D.C.G.* ii. 57 ff.), I mentioned the following Semitic equivalents for the *Hapaxlegomenon* ἐπιούσιος:

1. חמידי, Shemtob ben Shaphrut = continual.

2. על היקום, T. B. Jona, Rome, 1668 = '*supersubstantialis*.'

3. חַקֵּנוּ, Delitzsch, Salkinson, Resch = 'of our set' = convenient or needful.

4. תמיד
5. תדירא } Taylor = continual.

6. *de çorkâna*, Schultze = of our need.

7. *de sunqânan*, Peshito = of our want.

8. סְגֻלָּתֵנוּ, Rönsch = of our possession.

9. דעותרא, Syro-Palestinian version = of riches; 8 and 9 taking ἐπιούσιος in the sense of περιούσιος.

10. מַסְפֵּת, Arnold Meyer = sufficient.

11. אמינא, the Old Syriac = lasting.

12. מחר, Jerome = to-morrow.

At Jerusalem there is, as I mentioned in the same article, near the traditional site of Gethsemane, the Church of the Paternoster, showing in the quadrangle the Lord's Prayer in thirty-two languages. The church was built in 1868 by the Princess Latour d'Auvergne. Not on marble, as is sometimes stated, but on small faience tablets the writing presents itself; some of the tablets were put in upside down, as in the case of the Hebrew. Now it is interesting that there the rendering No. 1 of Shemtob is given; how they hit upon that I do not know.

A thirteenth rendering I have since found in a little publication of a printer at Bâsle (W. Haas, *Das Gebet des Herrn in 100 Sprachen und Mundarten*, 1830, pp. 22):

13. דבר יום = daily; cf. Ex $5^{13.19}$.

As 8 and 9 so give 1, 4, 5, 11 to the word the same meaning, again 3 6, 7, 10, and 13; 12 stands still alone. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Foundation Sacrifice.

IN the Notes on Driver's *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible* (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June, p. 389), the explanation of Jos 6^{26} as an example of the Foundation Sacrifice is referred to as 'new.' It is worth while, however, to be reminded that, more than half a century ago, the English theologian (assuming the explanation to be Dr. Driver's) was anticipated by a Scottish genius. On a Sabbath in the last year of his apprenticeship (1822), Hugh Miller was told by a sun-burnt herd-boy, beside the ruins of Craighouse, the whole history of the goblin that haunted the 'gray fantastic rag of a castle.' '"*Oh, they're saying* it's the spirit of the man that was killed on the foundation-stone, just after it was laid, and then built intil the wa' by the masons, that he might *keep* the castle by coming back again; and *they're saying* that a' the verra auld houses in the kintra had murderit men builded intil them in that way, and that they have a' o' them their bogle." I recognized in the boy's account of the matter an old and widely spread tradition, which, whatever may have been its original basis of truth, seems to have so far influenced the buccaneers of the seventeenth century as to have become a reality in their hands. . . . There is a figurative peculiarity in the language in which Joshua denounced the man who should dare rebuild Jericho that seems

to point to some ancient pagan rite of this kind. Nor does it seem improbable that a practice which existed in times so little remote as those of the buccaneers, may have first begun in the dark and cruel ages of human sacrifices. "Cursed be the man before the Lord," said Joshua, "that riseth up and buildeth this city of Jericho; *he shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it.*"'

My Schools and Schoolmasters was published in 1854.

Referring to another portion of the Notes on the same topic, where it is suggested that the Ta'anach infants 'had died too young to be buried in the family sepulchres,' a parallel may be found in this region of China. Infants dying in their first year are buried neither in the family sepulchre nor anywhere else. Wrapped in a rough bit of old straw matting, the body is placed, according to proper rules, in an exposed spot in a field or by the roadside. It is hoped that the dogs will completely devour the remains. In cases where several children of the family have previously died young, the body is beaten and scolded. The underlying idea is so to ill-treat the dead child that its spirit will not care to be reborn into the family, for, if born again, it would necessarily cheat the family by a second early death.

F. W. S. O'NEILL.

Fakumen, Manchuria.

Seventy and Seven (Gen. iv. 24, Matt. xviii. 22).

WHEN Music and Verse their alliance began,
On the lips and the fingers of primitive Man,
They sang how the scope of the vengeance of Heaven
On the Manslayer's head would be 70 and 7.

Since God the Redeemer came down from above,
And breathed in our ears His own music of Love,
The measure of Mercy on Earth as in Heaven,
To the sinner repentant is 70 times 7.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

Jacquier's New Testament Introduction.[1]

THESE two volumes complete the task undertaken five years ago by the Abbé Jacquier, a Roman Catholic professor at Lyons. Since Godet died, leaving his Introduction unfinished, no complete Introduction to the New Testament has been published by any French scholar, and Jacquier's volumes, which are both cheap and uniform, therefore occupy a niche of their own. Their success abroad is proved by the mere fact of their circulation. The first volume, on the Pauline Epistles, is already in its sixth edition. The second, on the Synoptic Gospels, is in its fifth. The third discusses Acts and the Catholic epistles, with a brief appendix upon recent investigations into the language of the New Testament. The fourth is devoted to the Johannine literature. All are characterized by a lucid, courteous manner of presenting the subject, as well as by fair-minded candour.

Like Godet, Jacquier belongs to the strictly conservative school. He does for French readers what Belser and Barth have done recently upon a smaller scale for German—though Barth works in a slightly more flexible fashion. The traditional views of the date, authorship, and spirit of the New Testament writings are almost invariably defended. Thus, even in discussing the Pericopê (John 7^{53}–8^{11}), Jacquier observes naively: 'En tout cas, elle est canonique, puisqu'elle est dans la Vulgate et qu'on doit la considérer comme visée par la formule du Concile de Trente, "cum omnibus suis partibus"' (iv. p. 279). This is the general refuge of the author. Behind the Vulgate, in matters of this kind, we should not venture to pass. On the Fourth Gospel, and on the Apocalypse, he is not nearly so hospitable to modern criticism as his learned fellow-churchman, P. Calmes. Even on the problem of 2 Peter, he cannot make up his mind to admit that this Epistle borrowed from Jude. The resemblances between the two writings he discusses at length, only to reach the pessimistic verdict, 'le problème ne nous paraît pas résolu' (iii. p. 293). This voluntary humility is very disappointing. There are already quite enough locked doors in New Testament criticism, with critics rattling vigorously at the handles; when one has been finally opened, as that of the Jude–2 Peter relationship surely has been, it is a pity to allow traditional prejudices in favour of 2 Peter to reclose the door. M. Jacquier holds that this Epistle, by the way, must have been written before 70 A.D., as no reference to the fall of Jerusalem occurs within its pages.

An Introduction, which presents results of this

[1] *Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament.* Par E. Jacquier. Tome troisième, 1908; tome quatrième, 1909. Paris: Victor Lecoffre.

kind, must depend for its value and attractiveness to foreign readers upon the ability with which the case is stated against competing theories. Abbé Jacquier knows the latter, though his acquaintance with them is far from adequate. He diligently records from time to time a number of modern views adverse to his own. But he does not come to terms with them. He does not ignore or confute them with anything of Zahn's astonishing ingenuity. Frequently views are stated and left side by side, without any penetrating criticism of their comparative relevance or importance. A case in point occurs (iv. p. 317 f.) with regard to the date of the Apocalypse. It is a minor issue, but it will serve to bring out what I mean. Recently Bishop Chase has revived the old hypothesis that the testimony of Irenæus (οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη) refers not to the publication of the Apocalypse, but to John himself. 'He (not it) was seen.' There are arguments for this rendering, but it is quite untenable. Abbé Jacquier, however, who leans to the earlier date of the Apocalypse in order to secure the unity of its authorship and that of the Fourth Gospel, seizes Dr. Chase's suggestion without more ado. If an unexamined life is not worth living, according to good Greek authority, an unexamined or imperfectly examined argument of this kind is hardly worth presenting to critical readers. They want to drive down oaken piles, not to use unseasoned timber from yards even of honourable name.

Jacquier's volumes of Introduction, therefore, for all their usefulness and painstaking care, cannot be said to advance the criticism of the New Testament literature. They offer a sober survey of the country on its external aspects rather than a guide. The four volumes show wide, if rather casual, reading on certain lines and a conscientious endeavour to cast light upon the salient aspects of the subject. But they are a convenient popular manual for those who desire to possess reasons for adhering to the traditional position, rather than a volume of independent, pioneering scholarship.

JAMES MOFFATT.

The Latest Light from Oriental Archaeology: the Date of Deuteronomy.

A VERY interesting and important paper has just been read by Professor Naville before the French Academy, under the title of *Une Interpretation égyptienne d'un Texte biblique: la Découverte de la Loi sous le roi Josias.* Professor Maspero had already drawn attention to the analogy between the discovery of the Law in the temple at Jerusalem in the reign of Josiah and similar discoveries of sacred books which, according to the hieroglyphic texts, were made in the course of repairing or restoring the temples of Egypt. Professor Naville has now undertaken an exhaustive examination of the Egyptian evidence, and shows (1) that the books related to the ritual or law of the sanctuary, and (2) that it was the custom to bury them in the walls or foundations of a temple at the time of its erection, where they were again found when the building had decayed and was being repaired. He then concludes that the Egyptian evidence compels us to believe that the Jewish book of the Law, usually identified with Deuteronomy, must have been similarly placed in the walls of the temple of Jerusalem when it was built by Solomon, and that, therefore, instead of being a forgery of the age of Josiah, it is at least as old as the age of Solomon. Hence we have an explanation of the fact that there is no allusion in it either to the temple or to the kingdom of Assyria.

It was, in short, the code of laws intended to be laid among the foundations of Solomon's temple, thus establishing definitely that the temple was the place in which Yahveh had set His name. It could not be removed elsewhere, like the ark of the covenant: 'buried in the stones or bricks of the wall it was even better veiled from sight than the Holy of Holies itself; it was as if Yahveh had put Himself there; to use an expression in the book, it was one of "the hidden things that belong to Yahveh."'

Professor Naville goes on to point out the peculiar fitness there was in thus associating the new sanctuary of Yahveh with the code of laws. Oriental archæologists are now agreed that the earlier literature of Israel must have been in the cuneiform script and the Babylonian language, and that the Hebrew alphabet and language were not employed for literary purposes before the Davidic era. It is therefore significant, as Professor Naville aptly observes, that 'without speaking of the Book of Proverbs which bears his name, we are told of Solomon' that he was a sort of founder of Hebrew literature (1 K 4^{31}). He is the only king of Israel or Judah who is said to have been literary, and it

is accordingly more natural to ascribe to him, rather than to any other of the princes who reigned at Jerusalem, 'the change in the mode of writing and the adoption of characters infinitely more simple and manageable than the cuneiform.'

That the book was intended to be placed in the foundations of the temple would explain why it should have been written. What reason otherwise would there have been for rewriting laws most of which are to be found in the other books of the Pentateuch? They were collected, accordingly, into a single document, and laid in the foundations of the temple, with a short historical introduction describing under what circumstances the laws had been promulgated by Moses in the desert. We have in it, therefore, an exact analogy to the 64th chapter of the Egyptian Book of the Dead which was written in order to be buried in the foundations of the temple of Thoth at Hermopolis, where it was discovered centuries later, and which was entitled 'The Chapters of the Going Forth of the Day in a single Chapter.' In the case of Deuteronomy we might render this: 'The Books of the Law in a single Book.' As a collector of the older laws Solomon would have been the Khammu-rabi or Napoleon of Israel.

That no mention is made of the book in the description of the building of the temple is intelligible enough. The book would have been placed under the foundation-stone at the moment when the latter was laid, which, in Egypt at any rate, was a solemn ceremony, accompanied by certain rites. In the account of the building as we have it, however, the laying of the first stone is passed over in silence, and consequently no reference to the book was possible.

Professor Naville has not referred to Pr 25^1, which, in the light of our present archæological knowledge about Babylonian libraries, gives striking support to the conclusions of his paper. Here we have an Introductory title similar to those which were customary in Egyptian and Babylonian literature: 'These also are the proverbs of Solomon which Hezekiah's people copied out' (Sept. ἐξεγράψαντο). The verb signifies literally 'caused to pass over'; whether this means 'to pass over' or 'translate' from one language to another, *i.e.* from Babylonian cuneiform to Hebrew, or from one document to another, *i.e.* to re-edit, is uncertain. The Talmud would favour the first interpretation, the usage of the Assyrian scribes in the age of Hezekiah would favour the second. The word (*he'ĕtîq*) in any case would have been a technical term, though owing to the loss of so large a part of ancient Hebrew literature it is met with in this passage only. As most of the royal buildings of Jerusalem, as well as the temple, were erected by Solomon, the library also would have been his creation. He was, in fact, a sort of Jewish Assur-bani-pal, and hence is credited, as Professor Naville has observed, with being not only a patron of literature, but an author himself. It does not follow, however, that the works ascribed to him were actually written by the king (he is indeed said to have 'spoken,' not written, them, 1 K $4^{32.33}$); more probably, as in the case of Babylonia and Assyria, they would have been composed by the learned men at his court for the royal library. I have not yet had time to examine minutely Pr 25–29 from an Assyriological point of view, so as to see whether these chapters show any traces of having been translated from a Babylonian original, but from a cursory examination I should infer that they were written from the outset in Hebrew. If this proves to be correct, the rendering of the Septuagint and the A.V. will be justified.

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

After Twenty Years.

With this number THE EXPOSITORY TIMES enters upon its twenty-first annual volume.

And perhaps a word may be permitted on the difference between the present and the past. For the Bible is not the same to-day as it seemed to be twenty years ago, and the method of its interpretation is not the same. How can the difference best be expressed? By saying that twenty years ago the Bible was almost entirely interpreted from within, while now it is largely interpreted from without.

When we say that the Bible used to be interpreted from within, we do not mean to say that search was made throughout it, without discrimination of place or date, for texts to prove a doctrine that had already been formed philosophically. That would be to go further back than twenty years. We mean that the Bible was regarded—at least by all those to whom THE EXPOSITORY TIMES made its appeal—as incorporating the whole revealed will of God, so that if any part of God's purpose was obscure, one portion of the Bible must simply be made to throw light upon another portion. Was the doctrine of Election—'Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated'—difficult to comprehend? All that could be done was to show that the election of the Bible is to responsibility, so that even Pharaoh is spoken of as one of the elect; and then to take us back to the Old Testament and let us understand that 'Jacob' is not merely the man, but the nation which God chose wherewith to bless the other nations of the earth, and 'Esau' not the man, but the nations which were to be blessed.

It is not so now. When the late Dr. Cuthbert Hall of New York was delivering the Barrows Lectures, which have just been published in this country by Mr. Fisher Unwin under the title of *Christ and the Eastern Soul*, he used these words: 'Christ called Jews to be Christian Apostles. They obeyed and carried with them in Christianity, for its enriching, all that was true and eternal in Judaism, leaving behind only that which had served its end and fulfilled its course. Twenty centuries have passed. Many world conditions have changed. New conditions bring new needs. To-day the greatest religious need of the world is for a Christianity deepened and spiritualized through the recovery of elements germane to the Oriental Consciousness, and best interpreted thereby.'

These words explain our meaning. Can any of us deny their truth? Can any of us comprehend the fulness of the change to which they give voice? For it is not simply that in order to interpret the Bible we must now know something of the religion of the Persians and the Babylonians. It is that we must know something of the history of Religion. But it does not follow that the Bible is more perplexing to us than it was to our fathers, it only follows that it is a more comprehensive book. The Bible is less the reflexion of God than before. It is now the reflexion of the God of the whole earth.

And it is not the history of Religion only that the Bible now calls upon for its interpretation. It is Ethics, it is Psychology, it is Philosophy. The philosophy of the future, of the immediate future at least, is the philosophy of Eucken. And what is the philosophy of Eucken? It is a philosophy that is religious. Eucken would not be offended if you said it is a religion that is philosophical. For 'the line that is so often drawn between what philosophy has to do and what religious thought has to do disappears for him, because he holds that both ought to look out from the same view-point—the life of the Spirit.' The last sentence is a very recent utterance also. It is taken from an article on the 'Religious Philosophy of Eucken' in the *Guardian* for the 28th of July.

Now this does not mean that the task which is set the preacher of to-day—for the interpreter of the Bible is the preacher—is intolerably heavy. But it means that there must be a great change in his training and in his tools. Nor does it mean that the Bible is likely to lose its place. There has been within these twenty years great danger of the Bible losing its place. But that has been due to the persistence of many preachers in the use of an appeal to which there was no response in heart or conscience.

The Architectures of European Religions.

Mr. Stoughton Holborn has obtained permission from the publishers to re-issue in book form the

articles which he contributed on the architectures of various European religions to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. This is right and proper. For those students of Architecture who are not also students of Religion could scarcely be expected to purchase the Encyclopædia. And yet it is quite certain that they cannot afford to neglect these articles.

Getting permission to republish them, Mr. Stoughton Holborn seems to have got permission to publish them handsomely. The wood-cuts in the text are delightfully artistic, while the page illustrations on separate paper reach the highest attainment of art printing. The square page with the broad margin is pleasing, and the binding is in good taste. Perhaps the book may do something to give men an idea of the perfection of work which the editor of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* aims at. The title is *An Introduction to the Architectures of European Religions* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net).

Some Autumn Books.

As we go to press three publishers' lists for the autumn already reach us.

Messrs. A. & C. Black will issue Dr. Kelman's book on *The Holy Land* without the illustrations. They will also issue a new and enlarged edition of Dr. J. G. Frazer's *Passages of the Bible*.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark announce Dr. Oswald Dykes's Cunningham Lectures, of which the title is to be *The Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*. They also announce a new book by the Rev. W. L. Walker, *The Gospel of Reconciliation*. Principal Skinner's *Genesis* is nearly ready, and the second volume of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS is well on the way.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier promise another appreciation by Principal Whyte. It is *Thomas Shepard: Pilgrim Father and Founder of Harvard*. They have also nearly ready *The Original Religion of China*, by Dr. John Ross. There is just one complete account of the religion of China in existence, Professor de Groot's magnificent book, but it costs much money. This book will be reasonable in price and reliable.

Speaking of books, we may mention that Professor Hope Moulton's *Prolegomena to the Grammar of New Testament Greek* is being translated into German by Dr. Karl Dieterich, a most able and learned scholar.

Another item of interest is the arrangement that has been made for the editorship of Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'Bible Class Handbooks.' The place of Dr. Dods has been taken by Dr. Kelman, so that Dr. Whyte and Dr. Kelman now work together in that as in so much else.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. A. C. Murray, Heidelberg, Cape Colony, to whom a copy of Law's *Tests of Life* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for November must be received by the 1st of October. The text is Rev $7^{9.10}$.

The Great Text for December is Rev 7^{14}—'These are they which come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' A copy of Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought*, or Dykes's *Christian Minister*, or Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, will be sent for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Rev 14^{13}—'And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works follow with them.' A copy of Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for February is Rev 20^{12}—'And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works.' A copy of Law's *Tests of Life* or Newton Clarke's *Doctrine of God* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Rev 21^{1}—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more.' A copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, or Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Forrest's *Christ of History and of Experience*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE discovery among the books of the month of a book by Professor Swete is an event of most uncommon interest. For Professor Swete does not publish often; but when he publishes, whatever the subject may be, there always follows a comfortable sense of completeness. His commentaries on St. Mark and the Apocalypse contain everything, and they contain nothing more.

The new book is entitled *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). That is its title and that is its topic—that finally, we say, and nothing more than that. And there is an air of authority also that comes with it. For Professor Swete, who represents the sanity of English scholarship at its best, writes objectively, not once using even the editorial 'we,' but leaving the facts to make their own impression.

His subject is the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, and, as we have said, he does not depart from it. But his book is clear evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the individual to-day. For it was certainly the Holy Spirit that directed him to make the doctrine of the Holy Spirit his special and lifelong study, that he might give reality again to a doctrine which has become unreal and almost incredible to the general mind through much hysterical handling.

Now there is no part of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit that stands more urgently in need of exposition than the relation of the Spirit to the personal life. And in that part of his subject Professor Swete is most orderly and convincing. It is a development of the doctrine which we owe to St. Paul.

For the Old Testament, with one or two possible exceptions, makes no reference to the ethical action of the Spirit of God on the individual man. The Spirit there stands in relation to Israel, or the Messiah, or the prophetic order. Nor do the Synoptic Gospels carry us much further, for the baptism of the personal life by the Spirit of Christ did not begin till the ministry was ended. The Spirit 'was not yet.' Even the Book of Acts is limited to the effects of the Spirit's coming on the Church and the world. It is St. Paul, says Dr. Swete, to whom the honour belongs of having called attention to the change which the Pentecost made in the possibilities of the individual human life.

The first thing is the psychology of the matter. And that is the first thing with St. Paul. In the earliest of his Epistles (1 Th 5^{23}) he represents man in his completeness as consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Professor Swete does not believe that an actual trichotomy is contemplated here,

but there is at least a mental distinction made between three elements in our nature which are regarded as necessary to its perfection. Of the soul the Apostle says nothing in this connexion beyond contrasting 'psychic' men, those who are not under the control of the Spirit of God, with 'pneumatic' or spiritual men, those who are under that control. It is the human spirit that is the sphere in which the ethical work of the Holy Spirit is carried forward.

Now the Holy Spirit does not create the spirit in man. The spirit is present in every man from the beginning. In each individual of the race, 'the spirit of the man which is in him' (1 Co 2^{11}) answers to the Spirit of God. But although the Spirit of God finds in man a spiritual nature in which it can work, the human spirit is in so imperfect or depraved a condition that a complete renovation, even a re-creation, is necessary.

There must therefore be a moment at which this change begins, or there must be an act in which it is potentially included. That moment and that act, says Professor Swete, are identified with the admission of the convert into the Church, by baptism into the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus. This is his palingenesia, his second birth, his renovation by the Spirit of Christ, giving the promise of a new life.

Professor Swete is not so foolish as to suggest that the act of baptism is the moment of regeneration without regard to the state of mind of the recipient. The right state of mind is taken for granted, and in the early Church, at least, would almost always be there. Then, although the baptized man may afterwards grieve the Holy Spirit (Eph 4^{30}), outrage Him (He 10^{29}), and even extinguish the Divine fire in his heart (1 Th 5^{19}), yet from that moment he can never again be in the position of one to whom the Spirit has not come. In that moment, with that great sacramental act, the life of the Spirit begins.

But as it proceeds the life of the Spirit encounters a hostile force. St. Paul calls that force the Flesh. And henceforth the history of the Christian life is the history of a lifelong war: 'The flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, for these powers are opposed to one another' (Gal 5^{7}). What is this flesh? It is not human nature in itself. It is human nature as fallen and sinful. It is the principle of moral decay, the precise opposite in man of the principle of life which is communicated by the Spirit of God. And as the one principle or the other holds the upper hand with a man, that man is said to walk 'after flesh' or 'after Spirit.' Neither the one man nor the other pursues his course of life without resistance from the opposite force. But as the Spirit gains upon the flesh, there grows up within a man the 'mind of the Spirit,' an attitude of thought and will which changes the direction of the inner life, inclining it to the divine and the eternal.

St. Paul lays emphasis upon the warfare between the flesh and the Spirit because of the reality of it, and also because of the intensity of it in the case of his Gentile converts. They live in an atmosphere, and they have been rescued from habits, which make it necessary for them to be ever on their guard against relapsing into the lusts of the flesh. But this warfare is not everything. While defending the human spirit against the flesh, the indwelling Spirit is also busily engaged building up a new life within, and so restoring the human life to the image of God. This is what is called the work of Sanctification, and this is why the Holy Spirit is called the Sanctifier. The Holy Spirit is not the only sanctifier. There are places in the New Testament in which sanctification is connected with our relation to Jesus Christ, and they are perhaps more numerous than those in which sanctification is attributed to the Spirit. Yet there is no term, says Dr. Swete, which so fully covers the effects upon human nature of the presence in it of the Holy Spirit of God as this word Sanctification.

For the first result of the coming of the Spirit is our consecration to the service of God. In this sense the change is merely one of relation and non-moral, so that even the body receives consecration from the Divine indwelling (1 Co 6^{19}), and a heathen who has married a Christian woman is said to be sanctified by the union (1 Co 7^{14}). But the word 'Sanctification' expresses also the actual equipment for service of each of our faculties—that progressive sanctification which gradually brings under its sway every part of our person until the whole man is renewed after the image of Him who created him.

Professor Swete describes the steps of this progressive sanctification. First of all the Holy Spirit creates in us a sense of our filial relation to God. The Spirit in the human heart is 'the spirit of the adoption,' which corresponds with the spirit of sonship in the Christ, and cries in us as in Him, 'Abba, Father.' Thus there is opened a communication between God and the individual life, and the same Spirit that opened it keeps it open. It is through the Christ that we have our access to the Father; but we have it in the Spirit.

With the reopening of this fellowship the love of God is poured into the heart, awakening on man's part a responsive love to God. Hope, peace, and joy follow in the region of the Spirit. And there is a new apprehension of truth, another powerful instrument of Sanctification. The truth is learnt in the experience of the Christian life, but the Holy Spirit is the teacher, leading into all the truth. This apprehension of truth is not merely an addition to our intellectual furniture; it is a power in the life. It makes for righteousness and holiness of truth.

For as the work of Sanctification proceeds it is made known in character and conduct. St. Paul names nine great characteristics of the Christian, calling them the fruit of the Spirit (Gal $5^{22.\ 23}$). The list begins with those which indicate the attitude of the inner self to God. For the Spirit first creates right relations between the soul and God. The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace. From these it proceeds to remodel personal and social life. For as St. Paul saw the religion of the Spirit, it not only filled men with love, joy, and peace, but it surrounded them with an atmosphere of forbearance, kindness, goodness, honesty of purpose, ability to endure affront, and self-control.

Now it was surely a great thing that a character such as this should have been realized even in part within a generation after the coming of the Spirit, in the midst of heathen surroundings, and in the lives of men who had recently escaped from heathenism. It went far to establish the Divine authority of the gospel—further, indeed, than the greatest of physical miracles. God, it was evident, had set His seal on men who manifested such signs of a supernatural life, some of which could be seen by all observers. To use another Pauline metaphor, they were an open 'letter of Christ,' which all the world could read, written with the Spirit of the living God.

The last metaphor is appropriate. For the last thing is this. The life of the Spirit of Christ in the individual believer is the very life of Christ in him, reproducing the character of Christ by 'forming Christ' within his heart: 'He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit'; there is a spiritual unity between Christ and himself, of which the human spirit is the sphere, and the Spirit of Christ the author. The indwelling of the Spirit is the indwelling of Christ; and Christ, dwelling in the heart by the Spirit, becomes the life of our lives. The inner life is strengthened and enriched until at last it is 'filled unto all the fulness of God.'

The same month in which we receive from Cambridge Professor Swete's book on the Holy Spirit, we receive also a book scarcely less notable from Oxford. And the Oxford book follows on just where the Cambridge book leaves off, as if it had been written for the purpose. The author is

Dr. R. L. Ottley, Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology. The title of the book is *Christian Ideas and Ideals* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a volume of Christian ethic. And inasmuch as the ethic of the Christian life is the fruit of the Spirit, every volume of Christian ethic may be said to follow after a volume on the Holy Spirit. If Professor Ottley had proceeded to describe the various Christian virtues, he would have fitted in well enough with Professor Swete. But there would have been no surprise in that. The surprise is that Professor Ottley, dealing with the great ethical ideas of Christianity, with those principles of conduct which issue in the several Christian virtues, begins with the idea of the indwelling of the Spirit of God—begins with that idea and ends with it, his whole book being an exposition of it, and all other ideas falling into their place within it.

'The supreme end and aim of Christianity,' says Professor Ottley, 'is the communication of power. The gospel is not merely a revelation of the Divine nature—rich, satisfying, many-sided, and corresponding profoundly to the complex needs of humanity; nor merely a system of ethics—spiritual, comprehensive, and in the truest sense practical. It is a principle of life, of energy, of movement; it heightens vitality; it makes for efficiency in work and for greatness of character. The gospel is *the power of God unto salvation*. The kingdom of God is not in word, but *in power*.'

Now the point is that this power is not communicated from without. It is part of the man's own personality. It is not a gift bestowed upon a man in order to meet an emergency. It is there before the emergency arises, ready to be drawn upon at will. There is a gift, but it is the Holy Spirit, given once for all, and the power is the might of the Spirit working in human hearts and strengthening them to receive, to know, to act, and to endure.

When St. Paul makes his prayer for the Ephesian Church, what does he pray for? Not only, or even chiefly, the spiritual enlightenment of his converts, not their protection and support amid the fiery trials of life in a great heathen city, not the growth in them of the graces of brotherly love and unity of spirit. What he prays for is the gift of the indwelling presence of Deity. For the Spirit of God, making for Himself a habitation in the inmost recesses of a man's personality, is more than knowledge, or resistance, or fellowship. It is power.

It is therefore no surprise to discover that the desire of power has a place in Christian ethic. There is a word in the New Testament which signifies to be ambitious (φιλοτιμεῖσθαι). It is one of those words which have been rescued from base associations and ennobled by the gospel. Its use is peculiar to St. Paul. For it is in the writings of St. Paul that the word 'power' continually recurs as a kind of watchword or keynote. Three times St. Paul employs the word, each time giving it its full value in the suggestion of power as a legitimate object of attainment, but each time with a difference. So that when the three occasions are taken together, St. Paul's use of this one word covers the whole round of practical Christian life.

The first occasion is in writing to the Thessalonians (1 Th 4^{11}). 'We exhort you, he says, to make it your aim (φιλοτιμεῖσθαι) to be quiet and do your own business.' The next occasion is in his letter to the Romans (15^{20}). Here he describes himself as making it his aim to preach the gospel not where Christ was already named. The third occasion is in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says, 'We make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him.'

Canon Ottley does not suggest that the three occasions were chosen deliberately to cover the whole round of spiritual activity. What he sug-

gests is more important than that. It is that to the mind of this apostle, the apostle who felt himself to be a living monument of God's redemptive might, and whose characteristic message to Churches and individuals is, 'Be strong' (1 Co 16^{13}, Eph 6^{10}, 2 Ti 2^{1}), this word carried the immediate thought of power, and whenever it was used, it was used to determine one of three important stages in the progress of the moral life.

In the first use of it the man's thoughts are turned upon himself; in the second they are turned upon the world; in the third they are turned upon God. The Christian has his own business. Has he chosen it, or has it been thrust upon him? It may not greatly matter. He has his own business, the occasion for the use of his own faculties. These faculties are not the gift of the Holy Spirit, but as certainly are they not suspended thereby, or any particular characteristic of them obliterated. Rather are they sharpened, differentiated, brought individually to the manifestation of the fulness of their power. And as he uses his own faculties to do his own business, he does not needlessly disturb others.

The next time that St. Paul uses the word he looks away from himself. For the man in whom the Spirit dwells is not encouraged to live in a small circle of personal or family interests. He does actually live in a world of sin, in a world that needs a gospel. He is ambitious of power, and in order to obtain it he must no doubt make it his aim to train his faculties. But when they have been trained, how is he to use them? Not merely in providing for his own and for those of his own household, but in giving to others that very gift which has given him the use of his faculties and the possession of his power—the gift of the gospel. He must preach the gospel, because it is 'the power of God unto salvation.' And he must preach it in his own way, in his own circumstances, not imitating another man's method in whom the same Spirit of God has produced a diverse operation; nor following another into his field of operation, but finding his own work, whether in regions where Christ has not already been named, or in those regions where His name has been named so often that it has become a hardening commonplace.

On the third occasion St. Paul looks to God: 'We make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him.' For this is the home to which the spirit of man, which has had its faculties disciplined by doing its own business and then goes out to preach the gospel to a world of sin, ever returns for rest and renewing. To be well-pleasing to Him. This was the purpose for which man was made at the beginning: this is the purpose which the new man fulfils at the end.

There is a discussion on another page of the proper translation of St. John 14^{1}. The translation in the Authorized and Revised English Versions is, 'Ye believe in God, believe also in me.' The translation of the American Revised Version, called the 'Standard,' is 'Believe in God, believe also in me.' Other translations are considered. And at last the conclusion is reached that perhaps the most probable translation of all is the translation of the Sinaitic Syriac, 'Believe in God and ye believe in me.'

Is that possible? We do not mean the translation, for certainly the translation is possible, but the doctrine. Is it possible that our Lord said, 'Believe in God, and, as an inevitable consequence, ye believe in me'? If He did, what a doctrine it is. What an apologetic for Christianity. If the doctrine is true, the doctrine that belief in Jesus as Son of God and Saviour of the world is the natural and inevitable result of believing in God, what have our professional apologists been doing that they have not used this overwhelming argument for the propagation of the gospel?

And it is assuredly true, whether this is the best translation of the first verse of the fourteenth

chapter of St. John or not. It is the meaning of other passages of St. John's Gospel, in the Greek of which there is no ambiguity. Is it not the meaning of Jn 5^{23}, 'He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which sent him'? Is it not the meaning of Jn 6^{45}, 'Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me'? And most unmistakably of all, is it not the meaning of Jn 8^{42}, 'Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me'? And not only is it found in the Fourth Gospel. It is found in St. John's Epistles. It is found in all the Scriptures of the Old Testament and of the New. It is the one thing concerning Himself, embracing all other things, which Jesus drew from the Scriptures as He walked with the two disciples towards Emmaus. It is a doctrine that commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God the moment his eyes are opened to it.

But we must be careful. These words may seem too rhetorical yet to eyes that are only opening. And the issues are so great that no risks must be run. 'Believe in God, and ye believe in me'—if any man does not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Saviour of the world, he does not believe in God—that is the truth, in its most sober and simple clothing. Let us justify our declaration that the Bible contains it, and the conscience approves of it.

And in order to do so let us notice first of all *how easy it is to believe in God.* No doubt there have been unbelievers always, but they have always been in the minority, a poor foolish fraction of mankind. 'When I look up into thy heavens'—men have always said '*thy* heavens.' And when they have looked down into the earth they have said the same: 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.'

'When you were children,' said the late Professor Elmslie (you will find the passage in his *Memoir and Sermons*, edited by Dr. Robertson Nicoll, p. 81)—'When you were children, some time or other, I suppose, in your young lives, you got hold of a flower-seed and planted it in a pot of moist earth, and set it in the sunniest corner of your room. Morning after morning, when you awoke, you ran to see if the flower had begun to grow. At last your eagerness was rewarded by the sight of some tiny leaves which had sprung up during one night. Then the stalk appeared, frail and tender, and then more leaves, and buds, and branchlets, till at length there stood, blooming before you, a fair and fragrant flower. Who made it? Somebody worked to produce that flower. It could not make itself. The dead earth could not shape that lovely leaf; the bright sunshine could not paint those tendrils. A deep-thinking man, when he sees these wonderful things, must ask himself, Who fashioned them? Not the sunshine nor the air, but God, willed that that plant should grow. God toiled to make the plant—in your room, at your side.'

The argument is intelligible; it is unanswerable; and for nearly all of us it is enough. We have only to look up into the heavens; we have only to look down into the earth, and we find God. Even the difficulties of God's providence have not led to the denial of His existence. The great problem of the ancient Hebrews was the injustice, or at least the unjustifiableness, of unmerited suffering. It was the great problem of the ancient Hindus also. It is the great problem of Hebrews and Hindus still. But who will call the Hebrews or the Hindus atheists? It is easy to believe in God. That is the first thing.

But the next thing is, *how difficult it is to believe in Christ.* It was difficult for the disciples, and it is difficult for us.

It was not always difficult for the disciples. It was not difficult when they saw His glory at Cana of Galilee. It was not difficult for the three chosen disciples when they were with Him in the Mount. It was not difficult for the disciples to

believe in Him when they stood by the tomb of Lazarus and the four-days-dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes. It was not difficult at the descent of the Mount of Olives, when 'the whole multitude of the disciples rejoiced and began to praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen, saying, Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord, peace in heaven and glory in the highest.' It was not difficult then. But sometimes it was difficult.

It was difficult in the Upper Room. For the triumph of the Entry was all forgotten in the awe and mystery of the words which He was speaking about desertion and death. The ring of the 'Hosanna in the Highest' was far away now, as Jesus, being troubled in spirit, testified and said, 'One of you shall betray me.' It was difficult to believe in Him when they found themselves scattered, as He had prophesied, every man to his own; when the chief priests and rulers condemned Him to death; when Pilate delivered Him to their will; when He was crucified between two malefactors; when He was dead and laid in the tomb. It was difficult for the disciples to believe in Him in all the hour of the power of darkness.

And it is difficult for us to believe in Christ. For it all occurred so long ago, and we have so very little historical imagination. It all occurred so long ago, and so naturally, so humanly, so finally. 'In the lone Syrian town he lies'—is it not so? Are we really able to believe that He rose again from the dead and that He lives? That He lives? Do we not remember how near the end of his life it was that Dr. Dale of Birmingham made the discovery — Dr. Dale of Birmingham, the preacher of the gospel, endowed also with the gift of historical imagination—do we not remember how late in life it was, and with what a surprise the discovery came upon him?

And then there are the miracles. Do we really believe in miracles now? Or are we only saying angrily that we do? Do we believe that He was born of a virgin, or is it a relief to be told that the Virgin Birth is not an essential article? 'Go and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them.' It was enough for John and John's disciples. But was He not simply in advance of the art of healing of His day? Was He not simply able to anticipate the facts which psychology has now made the common property of us all?

But He claimed to be the Son of God. For there is no reasonable doubt that He did make that claim, and that the claim meant nothing less than Deity. The Son of God on earth, in human form, the Son of God dying, the Son of God dead!

Is that all? No, that is not all. There is the demand that He makes upon us. 'Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' There are those who are undisturbed when He makes Himself equal with God, but turn back and walk no more with Him as soon as they hear Him make a moral demand like that. Or again, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.' That saying is the parting of the ways to others. There are those, we say, who accept the Divinity, but deny the right of God Himself to say 'hate' to any man on earth. And there are yet more who accept the theology and are untroubled by the morality so long as it costs nothing in the application of it; but words like 'deny himself' are more than they can hear. The Sermon on the Mount is delightful in its extravagance, until the day comes upon which the hungry enemy is found waiting to be fed. How difficult it is then to believe in Christ.

And yet there is one great difficulty more. It is the difficulty that all this structure of perplexing theology and heart-searching ethic seems unnecessary. God is a Father. An earthly father is content with a reasonable obedience, and if his son has transgressed he is satisfied if he comes to him in sincere repentance, and gladly forgives him. Is God less willing to forgive? Why should we first lay the burden of a standard of life upon men's shoulders greater than they are able to bear, and then demand an atonement for the transgression of it, and that not even from themselves, but from the Son of God? How easy it is to believe in God, how difficult to believe in Christ.

But *it is impossible to believe in God without as a consequence believing in Christ.* 'Believe in God, and ye believe in me.'

For the God we believe in must be good, and He must take some interest in us. He must be good. And how good must He be? He must be altogether righteous. There must be no iniquity in Him. 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.' That is the God we believe in.

A little book has just been published with the title of *Karma and Redemption.* Its author is Professor A. G. Hogg, of the Christian College in Madras. Its object is to commend to the Hindus a better religion than that which they acquiesce in under this name of Karma. And what is that better religion? 'It seems to me,' says Professor Hogg, 'that the secret spring of real living religion anywhere can be nothing but a simplicity of assurance that the supreme religious Reality is humanly satisfying, or in the words of the Christian apostle that "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." No message less tremendous than this seems worth erecting into a religion. No faith less glorious than this is big enough to live upon.' The God whom we believe in must be good.

But He must also take some interest in us. Now, if He takes an interest in us, it must be to make us good as He is. It cannot be less than that. It must be in order that we also may be light, that in us also there may be no darkness at all.

Clearly, then, it is not enough that He should be ready to forgive us whenever we come to Him in repentance. Nothing short of fulness of fellowship is enough: nothing short of actual indwelling—we in Him, and He in us. And as no other way has apparently been thought of by God or devised by man to effect this fellowship except the one way of the Word made flesh, belief in God involves belief in Jesus Christ.

That way has actually effected the fellowship. The Word made flesh brought the spiritual or sinless into contact with the unspiritual or sinful; and the victory of the Cross left the spiritual in possession. And not only is this the one way that has been suggested, and not only is it the way in which fellowship between God and man has actually been accomplished, it is also the only way that could have been suggested or that could have accomplished it. For the fellowship between God and men must be complete. And in order to make the fellowship complete, either we must ascend to Him or He must descend to us.

Why, then, should we stumble at the miracles which He did? If the Son of Man had to descend from heaven, why should we expect that He would bring no trailing clouds of glory with Him? And if He descended, why should we hesitate to believe that when His work on earth was done He should ascend again? We place our emphasis on the Resurrection as if it were the crowning and incredible miracle. The crowning miracle is the fellowship. And the fellowship is not incredible. It is a fact of experience, widespread and undeniable. If God, in the fulfilment of His great interest in us, was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, the Resurrection was the most natural event in the reconciliation.

What remains of the difficulties of believing in Christ? There yet remains, perhaps, the ethical demand which He makes upon us.

We have called that demand appalling. But is it more appalling than the demand of the God of Abraham? Jesus said, 'If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own . . . children.' What did the God of Abraham say? He said, 'Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.' Do we answer that the God of Abraham is not our God? If we do, we do not mean it. All we mean is that the *form* of the sacrifice which God demands of us is not the form of the sacrifice which He demanded of Abraham. But the sacrifice itself is the same. It certainly cannot be less. For if the fellowship which He offers is perfect, it must be accepted by us whole-heartedly. No one can ever stand between us and Him. Every affection, as well as every duty, is to be offered on the altar of love to the Highest. 'I could not love thee, dear, so much, loved I not honour more.' Shall we not say—'loved I not *Jesus* more'? It is no parody; it is the lifting of the familiar sentiment up to the final reality.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, M.A., D.D., Edinburgh.

Hopeful's Story of his Soul.

It is noteworthy that in John Bunyan's experimental conversations and narratives, he does not linger upon the beginning or the end, but expands at great length the intermediate times of struggle and approach. The beginning gives its bare catalogue of sins, without any suspicion of longing or of afterthought, such as is apt to make narratives of spiritual experience dangerously suggestive. The end is brief, and in these close-packed paragraphs of spiritual victory we have the richest and most wonderful of all Bunyan's masterpieces (cf. the matchless conversation at the table in the House Beautiful, Faithful's closing sentence regarding the Valley of the Shadow, and the whole structure of *Grace Abounding*, on whose experiences all Bunyan's literary conversations are built). Here also, as in these other conversations, the bulk of the narrative is occupied with the struggles of the intermediate period. These may be divided into three parts, viz.:—

1. The Awakening of Conscience.

This Hopeful traces to his meeting with Christian and Faithful in Vanity Fair. There is a touch here of Bunyan's characteristic genius, in the concentrated significance of one sentence especially. Hopeful found by considering the things which he heard 'of beloved Faithful that was put to death for his faith . . . that the end of these things is death.' To the careless eye it would seem that the end of faith is death, judging by the fate of Faithful. But the impression made on Hopeful is precisely the opposite. It was Vanity Fair, and not its martyr, that was really under the doom. For the time being, death seized upon the immortal, and let the mortal go. But so great was the impression upon Hopeful of Faithful's hold upon immortality that he saw through the delusion and understood the secret of eternal life. Thus may death itself overreach its aim, and betray its secret of immortality, in the lives of followers of Him who has, through death, brought life and immortality to light.

In simple and graphic language, Hopeful goes on to describe his treatment of these first convictions. His Hopefulness, not yet grown wise and deep enough to deal with the facts of life, 'was not willing to know the evil of sin nor the damnation that follows,' and so he shut his eyes against the light. This is that vain optimism that refuses to face the facts, waiting as yet for its transformation into the blessed optimism that 'has faced life and is glad.'

Then follows a numbered list of the four causes of his resistance. First, he was ignorant that this sore grasp upon conscience is the method by which God's love works upon a man. The passage reminds us of the well-known lines in the first of Mrs. Browning's *Sonnets from the Portuguese* :—

> Straightway I was 'ware
> So weeping, how a mystic shape did move
> Behind me, and drew me backward by the hair;
> And a voice said in mastery, while I strove,—
> 'Guess now who holds thee?'—'Death,' I said.
> But there,
> The silver answer rang—'Not Death, but Love.'

Second, in contrast with this strange and formidable voice of God, there came the remembrance of sins, sweet and familiar and caressing. They are the sins of the flesh, which, as we have already seen, are the besetting sins of Hopeful, as Pride and Shame, sins of the spirit, were Faithful's besetting sins. Third, came the memories of companions, dear and alluring to Hopeful's companionable spirit. At this stage Hopeful is very much in the mind of old Jupiter Carlyle (of whom it was said that he was 'too good company to have any deep tincture of religion'). Writing in his Autobiography about the clergy of a town he had visited, he divides them into 'bucks,' whom he confessed to be 'inconceivably ignorant, and sometimes indecent in their morals,' and 'prigs' who were 'ignorant of the world, narrow-minded, pedantic.' For his part he preferred the former, whom he 'held to be most tolerable, because they were unassuming, and had no other affectation but that of behaving themselves like gentlemen.' Fourth, the troublesome and heart-affrighting character of the hours of conviction. The summary of the whole mood is this, that in every way religion appears dreary and the life of the world fascinating. All the *diablerie* and glamour, all the interest and joyousness, seem to be on the side of sin, and nothing but moroseness and gloom on the side of God.

It may be permitted us at this point to pause for a moment over the extreme detail and exactness of this self-analysis. When a man in describing his spiritual history can catalogue experiences with such definiteness as to number them 1, 2, 3, 4, we are apt to feel that the account is losing its reality. Within the soul there are no such numbered sequences, but a confused turmoil of emotions and experiences mingled past disentangling. 'Nothing,' as we know, 'falsifies history more than logic'; and when a spiritual biography is so minutely arranged as this, we shrink from the unreality that is so different from what we actually know of the inner life. Yet to the writers of an older day such analysis was natural. So accustomed were they to self-examination, that the whole of their inner life lay clear before their eyes, and any other style of dealing with it would have been unnatural to them. We may well envy them the sureness of their stride, even if we cannot allow that their analysis was always either accurate or wholesome. After all has been said that we may feel disposed to say in favour of a more healthy and less self-conscious way of thinking, we cannot but fall back, as Froude does in his *Bunyan*, and Masson in his *Three Devils*, on a positively envious appreciation of their strength and certainty. If these men had no sense of our doubts, it was their greatness rather than their littleness that gave them that security. They fought after the manner of giants in those days.

The first impulse of this untamed optimist was simply to throw off the sense of sin and all fears of conscience when they came, from very distaste of them. But he was in the grip of realities now, and their hold tightened. Then follows a list of things that brought his sins to his mind. All of these are everyday things, which presumably he had experienced without any impression countless times before—the meeting of a good man, a casual hearing of the Bible read, sickness in himself or a neighbour, death coming to another, or the remembrance that he himself must die, and especially that he must come to judgment.

The list shows a growing morbidness wrought by conscience in a high-strung and sensitive disposition. Yet still more we see in it a wonderful simplicity, such as is possible only to a very child-like man. The 'headache' reminds us of Monsieur Miranda in *Turf and Towers*, and his sudden fits of devotion to the Virgin. Still more forcible are the exquisite lines of *Bishop Blougram's Apology* :—

> Just when we are safest, there's a sunset-touch,
> A fancy from a flower-bell, someone's death,
> A chorus-ending from Euripides—
> And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
> As old and new at once as nature's self
> To rap and knock and enter in our soul.

The tolling of the bell is peculiarly touching,

coming from the pen of the bell-ringer of Elstow. Bunyan was fond of bell-ringing, and, to modern judgment, spent much unnecessary waste of conscience upon it. But if he denied himself the old pastime, he never ceased to hear the music, turned often to grave uses now. No reader of *The Holy War* will forget the sound of the Alarm Bell, and of Deadman's Bell there. And we can well imagine that Hopeful derived this terror at least from many an experience of Bunyan himself. Yet in such sounds there was surely more than the terrifying remembrance of death. Was there not also the hearing of those Bells of Is, the buried city beneath the sea, which Breton fishermen heard on quiet evenings? And would not Bunyan and Hopeful too have known what Renan meant when he said, 'I often fancy that I have at the bottom of my heart a city of Is, with its bells calling to prayer a recalcitrant congregation. At times I halt to listen to these gentle vibrations which seem as if they came from immeasurable depths, like voices from another world.'

2. The Attempt at Reformation.

The next phase is that of reformation. The conscience of his sins is in such hot chase after him that he can no longer evade it by the old light-hearted optimism that 'was not willing to know the evil of sin.' Every casual sound and sight increased the terror and misery, and now there was nothing left for him but to amend. The amendment was pretty drastic, on both its negative and positive sides, and for a time it seemed to meet the situation satisfactorily. But a sudden end came to all this happier mood when 'at the last my trouble came tumbling upon me again, and that over the neck of all my reformations.' The figure is very distinctly conceived and vivid. His Reformation is a sort of captive giant who is to act as porter to him, bearing all his sins. Each trouble as it arises is passed back to Reformation, whose burden grows heavier day by day. So they travel on, Hopeful, light-hearted, going before, and Reformation stumbling along behind him under the increasing burden, until at last the overtaxed slave can go no longer; and as he falls the burden tumbles over his neck on to the hapless Hopeful, whose plight is worse than ever. With this may be compared Nathaniel Hawthorne's clever conceit in *The Celestial Railroad*, where the pilgrims' burdens are deposited in the van, so that they travel light. But at the end of the journey, the burdens will be delivered to them again. It is but another version of Christian's terrible experience when he turned aside to make for the Town of Morality.

This experience is further analyzed into two distinct convictions: 1. Even the amended life is not really free from sin—'I have committed sin enough in one duty to send me to hell.' 2. The debts incurred before the amendment began are still unpaid. The second of these convictions is the more obvious of the two. To the unsophisticated conscience of the writer, life was a running account for sins with God, and nothing could be more characteristic than the crisp metaphor of the shopkeeper in whose book the old debt is still uncrossed. The former conviction shows a far deeper insight and a far more thorough dealing with conscience. It was a familiar thought of Bunyan's. In another of his writings he says: 'For there is not a day nor a duty; not a day that thou livest nor a duty that thou dost, but will need that Mercy should come after to take away thy iniquity.' Really, the first conviction is the sequel to the second. The sins of the past are not only standing, a dead weight of fact, that must somehow be reckoned with. They are living things that have laid hold upon the soul and continue to work in it, polluting its springs and deadening its powers. They attack our virtues, and not only enfeeble the present and the future actions, but have power to check the effects of the best efforts of the past. Rossetti never wrote more terrible words than these, from his *Vain Virtues*:

> What is the sorriest thing that enters hell?
> None of the sins, but this and that fair deed
> Which a soul's sin at length could supersede.

3. The Dawn of Light.

At this point of the story the dawn begins to break. One cannot but admire the thoroughness of the treatment, its unbroken sequence, its completeness, and its grasp. The point at which he has arrived is a view of the tainted and therefore worthless quality of any righteousness to which he can attain. Yet nothing but righteousness—perfect righteousness—will serve his turn. There can be no patching up now, no compromise. But where is such righteousness to be found? Evidently not in himself at his best, or in any other of his acquaintance. And so we see the hungry eyes of a guilty, conscience-stricken man, looking

everywhere with an almost envious eagerness, for innocence, to 'obtain the righteousness of a man that never had sinned.' There is little understanding as yet how, even if such a man were found, one might obtain his righteousness. At the present point we have only the passionate desire for righteousness, possible only to one who is sick of sin and fearfully entangled and tainted with it.

Then came the assurance that 'there was such a man,' and that is the next point in this wonderful progress of exposition, whose compression and completeness probably render it unique among all religious writings. It is this assurance that 'there was such a man, who had never sinned,' that goes down the ages triumphing over the sin of the world. Here and there a Renan, or a J. H. Newman, attempts the futile task of criticizing Jesus and finding some stain on His pure righteousness, or an H. G. Wells may go to the other extreme, and tell us that 'The Christian's Christ is too fine for me, not incarnate enough, not flesh enough, not earth enough.' But the conscience of sin-stricken humanity knows purity when it sees it better than they, and knows its need of purity, and flings them off on its way to Christ. He has put Himself at the head of all the ideals of all the ages, and He is still there, though obvious only to the clear eyes of fleeing sinners.

But here the human passes into the divine. 'A man that never had sinned' would be useless to Hopeful, if he were not more than that. So Bunyan next sets this righteousness on the throne of God. 'Go,' he says, in one of those immortal sentences of his, 'and thou shalt find Him upon a mercy-seat, where He sits all the year long, to give pardon and forgiveness to them that come.' This brings us back again to the heart of Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*, where he tells us that 'One day, as I was passing into the field, and that too with some dashes on my conscience, fearing lest all was not right, suddenly this sentence fell upon my soul, "Thy righteousness is in heaven," and methought withal, I saw with the eyes of my soul, Jesus Christ at God's right hand: there, I say, was my righteousness; so that wherever I was, or whatever I was doing, God could not say of me, "He wants my righteousness"; for that was just before Him.'

One thing more was needed to complete the discovery. It was the assurance that He 'did what He did, and died the death also, not for Himself but for me.' This brings us back to that great passage in the discourse at the supper-table of the House Beautiful, and beyond that to Bunyan's discovery of Luther's book on the Galatians, which *Grace Abounding* so graphically describes. It is when the great truths come home to the one soul that cries for them, when the infinite mercy of the Eternal God, revealed in Jesus Christ, bends over ME, as if there were no other than myself in all the universe, that the time of salvation has come at last. Then the soul, disgusted and terrified at the vision of himself as he is, finds his true self in God—sinless as Jesus Christ Himself, and assured in Him. This poor man has been out seeking his life, and he has found his life at last, 'hid with Christ in God.'

It is a strange feature of the story that Hopeful, generally so true to his name, is here so diffident. All sorts of questions arise, as to God's willingness to save, the limits within which the Atonement operates, the mystery of election, and so forth, just as they arose for Bunyan and are recorded in the long struggles of *Grace Abounding*. He receives the book, the same which makes Christian, from the first page of his narrative, distinctively 'the man with a book.' He prays the Father to reveal Christ to him, grasping here the double truth of revelation—Christ reveals the Father, and the Father reveals Christ. He goes so far as to cry with the boldness of simplicity, 'Lord, take this opportunity, and magnify Thy grace.' Yet the battle swings to and fro for a long time, betwixt hope and despair. The silence of God baffles him, but he continues crying to God—'Oh, friends!' says Bunyan, in *Grace Abounding*, 'cry to God to reveal Jesus Christ unto you; there is none that teacheth like Him.' He continues, for 'thought I with myself, If I leave off I die, and I can but die at the throne of grace.' Again we are in *Grace Abounding*—'Yet, my case being desperate, I thought with myself I can but die; and if it must be so it shall once be said, "that such an one died at the foot of Christ in prayer."'

4. Daybreak at Last.

But now, at length, we are to witness the full daybreak of light upon this tortured soul. He sees Christ at last 'with the eyes of his understanding.' It is not a vision, or an access of emotion, or an ecstasy of any kind. It is a man's

intellect applied to the promises of God. A flood of texts is poured upon him, but most of all those words, 'My grace is sufficient for thee.' Yet again *Grace Abounding* gives the key—'These words did with great power suddenly break in upon me: "My grace is sufficient for thee, my grace is sufficient for thee, my grace is sufficient for thee," three times together. And oh! methought that every word was a mighty word unto me; as "my," and "grace," and "sufficient," and "for thee"; they were then, and sometimes are still, far bigger than others be.' But indeed the whole of *Grace Abounding* moves from text to text of Scripture, and no more instinctive exercise could be found than the collecting of these texts in their order. On to the end, in that memorable last paragraph of the conversation in which we see the beginning of sanctification in the change of mood and taste, Bunyan continues to write his own spiritual autobiography. The last sentence is almost word for word with this from *Grace Abounding*—'Had I a thousand gallons of blood within my veins, I could freely then have spilt it all at the command and feet of this my Lord and Saviour.' It may not be amiss, although the passage is so familiar, to put side by side with this great account of a soul's progress, Cowper's lines:—

Since that dear hour that brought me to Thy foot,
And plucked up all my follies by the root,
I never trusted in an arm but Thine,
Nor hoped but in Thy righteousness divine.
My prayers and alms, imperfect and defiled,
Were but the feeble efforts of a child.
Howe'er performed, it was their brightest part,
That they proceeded from a grateful heart.
Cleansed in Thine own all-purifying blood,
Forgive their evil, and accept their good.
I cast them at Thy feet—my only plea
Is what it was—dependence upon Thee.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

Revelation vii. 9, 10.

'After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cry with a great voice, saying, Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb.'—R.V.

The Situation.

The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia end with the third chapter of the Apocalypse. The fourth and fifth chapters describe two great acts of worship. In the fourth chapter God is worshipped as the Creator. The four Cherubim or Living Creatures, representing all created life, are seen in perpetual adoration of their Maker. The four-and-twenty Elders—the patriarchs of the Old Covenant and the apostles of the New—fall down before the throne and worship God, saying, 'Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for thou hast created all things.'

The fifth chapter introduces the great work of Redemption. The Lamb appears in the midst of the throne, typical of the eternal Son, the Redeemer of the world. As He takes the Book of Doom from His Father's hands, the four Living Creatures and the four-and-twenty Elders fall down before Him and sing a new song, the song of the redeemed. The angel chorus pours forth its chant of thanksgiving to the Lamb, and every creature in heaven and earth and sea joins in the act of adoration.

Then at the ninth verse of the seventh chapter this second great act of worship enters on a new stage. The congregation, which hitherto has been drawn from the twelve tribes of Israel, is now seen to be a great multitude which no man can number, and it is taken from every nation upon the earth.[1]

The Sermon.

The redeemed are at worship. Where are they? They are in heaven, no doubt. But heaven is not to be identified with the world to come.

[1] See E. C. Paget, *Silence*, p. 208.

Life before the throne of God, says Swete, is life wherever spent, if it is dominated by a joyful consciousness of the Divine Presence and Glory. And he adds that the present picture must be correlated with that of chapters 21 and 22.[1]

The text suggests, firstly, the number and the variety of the redeemed; and secondly, their unity: their unity being seen (1) in their position or standing; (2) in character; (3) in their feeling; and (4) in their occupation.

I. The Number and the Variety of the Redeemed—'A great multitude which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues.' It is a vision. But St. John had some material to work upon. Says Harnack, 'The vigour and the variety of the forms already assumed by Christianity in these quarters are shown by the seven epistles to the Churches in the Johannine Apocalypse, by the whole tenor of the book, and by the Ignatian Writings.'[2]

But the vastness and the variety are the outcome of faith much more than of sight. In another place St. John states the impression which the physical eye receives: 'We are of God, and *the whole world lieth in wickedness*.' The eye of faith is the eye of that God who invited Abraham to go out into the evening and count the number of the stars. It is the eye of that Christ of God who planted the mustard seed which grew into a great tree.

It is an answer at last to the question, 'Are there few that be saved?' Were we to answer that question by sight, we should probably answer it quite otherwise, our judgment being formed partly from the state of our own heart, and partly from what we see around us. With our own heart we cannot be too stern. To it Christ's answer is addressed, 'Strive ye to enter in.' With our neighbour we cannot perhaps be too lenient. In any case our neighbour has a right to ask, 'Who made thee a judge or a divider over us?' We do not know enough to form a judgment.

'Who made the heart, 'tis He alone
Decidedly can try us;
He knows each chord, its various tone,
Each spring, its various bias.
Then at the balance let's be mute,
We never can adjust it;
What's done we partly may compute,
But know not what's resisted.'[3]

It is recorded of Daniel Webster that he was travelling in a then uninhabited part of Western America which is now covered by great and populous cities. As he and a friend were exploring that vast solitude, Webster suddenly lowered his head and seemed to listen.

'What are you doing?' inquired his friend.

'*I am listening for the tramp of the coming millions!*' replied Webster, his face aglow with confidence in the future greatness of his country.

The *variety* is as great as the number. What a distance St. John has travelled. It is a long way for his feet from the shores of Galilee to the isle that is called Patmos; but how much further for his heart, from his hope for the seed of Abraham to this assurance of all nations and tongues. There is nothing that some men seem so sure about as the limitation of our Lord's outlook. It is true He was not sent in His lifetime on earth but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But it was Christ, and not St. Paul, that enabled St. John to see the variety of the redeemed.

Every nation, and every variety of individual in every nation, every variety of gift and ministry—singers in choirs, nurses and doctors, visitors of the sick, priests, prophets, pastors, missioners, Bible-women, mothers, daughters—'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.' These are of the redeemed now. They do not need to wait for death to find their place in St. John's majestic vision. 'For all the saints who from their labours rest'—yes, certainly, for Livingstone and Gordon and Shaftesbury, and Lawrence, and Martin and Duff and Grenfell—but also for the saints who are still bearing the burden and heat of the day. O blessed union, fellowship divine! 'Next to the presence of God and the Lamb,' says Hort, 'the highest blessing is the presence of them who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.'

And what an encouragement it is to the missionary. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.'

In the early days of New Zealand history, Governor (afterwards Sir) George Grey was walking, on a lovely Sunday afternoon, with Bishop Selwyn. They entered a tent, followed by a messenger bearing dispatches which had just arrived. One letter to the bishop brought the news of the death of Siapo, a Loyalty Islander, who had become a

[1] Swete, *Apocalypse*, p. 100.

[2] *Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 329.

[3] See J. Conn, *The Fulness of Time*, p. 201.

Christian, and was being educated at Auckland under the bishop's supervision. Overcome with grief, Selwyn burst into tears. Then turning to the Governor, he exclaimed, 'Why, you have not shed a single tear!' 'No,' replied Grey, 'I have been so wrapped in thought that I could not weep. I have been thinking of the prophecy that men of every race were to be assembled in the kingdom of heaven. I have tried to imagine the joy and wonder prevailing there at the coming of Siapo, the first Christian of his race. He would be glad evidence that another people of the world had been added to the teaching of Christ.' 'Yes, yes,' said Selwyn, 'that is the true idea to entertain; I shall weep no more!'

II. Their Unity. 'The multitude that no man can number is a Society. Their robes have become white, because every stain of selfishness has been washed from them by the blood of the Lamb. Their palms show that they have gotten the victory over those causes which have destroyed the unity of kindreds and nations here. There is no dull uniformity, no single tongue: but all is harmonious amidst diversity. Here, some have glorified Power to the destruction of Meekness; some have pretended that Meekness is incompatible with Strength. There, all give glory to Him that sitteth on the throne, *and* to the Lamb. Here, men who are sealed in the Name of God have thought that they glorified that Name most by declaring His damnation of His enemies or theirs. In that company, the one word which is connected with the Divine Name is *Salvation*—salvation from the curse that men have made for themselves.'[1]

A Canadian bishop has lately described what he saw and heard one night. He and some friends were on one side of a great Canadian river; a company of Christian Indians on the other. As the Englishmen gazed into the falling fire they heard a hymn across the river. This was succeeded by a hush. The song of the Red men across the water drew out a song from them, and that touched the Indians to a prayer whose measured tones just reached them across the water.

O sweet communion of saints! 'What was the river between?' asks the bishop. What, indeed? On one side there rose prayers and praises in the language of Milton and Shakespeare, of saints and sages; on the other, in words borrowed by the wild hunters from the glee of the waterfall or from the sighing of the pinewood. Yet once again the whole earth seemed to be 'of one language and of one lip.' Out from the darkness there rose not a mere picture—a reality. Not the white Christ, with the blood-drops trickling down; but the living Christ, radiant and mighty. The harp of language with its myriad chords rang out through the starry silence. Not the Indian and the English only. Not one language was quite absent from the chorus. No longer Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin. 'All nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues' (The Archbishop of Armagh, in *Verbum Crucis*, pp. 126, 127).[2]

1. They are one in their Position or Standing—'standing before the throne and before the Lamb.' Once they were 'strangers and foreigners'; now they are 'fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God.' Once they were far off; now they are made nigh. Once they were afraid to draw near; now they have access with boldness. 'Happy are thy men,' said the Queen of Sheba to Solomon, 'who stand continually before thee.' Happy are they who stand before the throne and before the Lamb. It is this that marks the difference between the first vision and the second, between the worship of the Creator and the worship of the Redeemer. They who worship the Creator veil their faces with their wings; every one of the Redeemed, however vast their number and various, is made nigh by the blood of Christ.

2. In Character—'arrayed in white robes.' The white robes, we are afterwards told, are the righteous acts of the saints. They are an exchange for the 'filthy rags' of selfishness and self-righteousness. If still here, they may not be wholly white; but even here He sees them in their shield, and looks upon them in the face of His anointed, and He sees no iniquity in Jacob and no perverseness in His Israel. And yet it is no hollow, fictitious righteousness. Their will consents. They themselves have washed their own robes—only they have not washed them in their own blood, they have made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

It is related of Queen Victoria that one day she visited a paper-mill, the owner of which showed her through the works, and, not knowing who she was, took her, among other places, into the rag room. When she saw the filthy rags, out of which the paper is made, she exclaimed, 'How can these ever be made white?' 'Ah, lady!' was the reply, 'I have a chemical process of great power, by which I can take the colour even out of these rags!' Before she left the owner discovered that she was the Queen.

[1] F. D. Maurice, *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, ii. 278.

[2] The late Principal D. W. Simon illustrates (*Twice Born*, p. 194) the unity and diversity of the redeemed by quotations from the hymns of the world. First of all he shows how widespread is the acceptance of a hymn like 'Rock of Ages.' Our English hymn-books, he goes on, teem with translations from the German, with translations from the Latin, with translations from the Greek—'Jesus! Thy boundless love to me' (German); 'Jesus! Thou joy of loving hearts!' (Latin); 'O happy band of pilgrims' (Greek). It is an illustration that might be worked out easily and with much effect.

A few days after the Queen found lying upon her writing-desk some of the most beautifully polished writing-paper she had ever seen. On each sheet were stamped the letters of her name, and her likeness. There was also a note from the mill-owner, asking her to accept a specimen of the paper, with the assurance that every sheet was manufactured out of the dirty rags she had seen.

3. In Feeling—'and palms in their hands.' Archbishop Trench will have it that it is a feeling of joy. For the Apocalypse, he says, moves altogether in the circle of sacred imagery; all its symbols and images are derived from the Old Testament. And so he refers to the Feast of Tabernacles, when with branches of palm trees the people rejoiced before the Lord seven days. But the seer of the Apocalypse was certainly familiar with the palm as a symbol of victory. And perhaps the two ideas are not so far apart. If it was joy, it was the joy of a great triumph, triumph over the world, the flesh, and the devil; the joy of being more than conquerors through Him that loved them. In the presence of Christ has always been fulness of joy, downward from the time in which 'your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day.'

4. In Occupation—'they cry with a great voice, saying, Salvation.' Their occupation is worship, of course. All their life is worship. St. John cannot conceive any one of the redeemed otherwise occupied than in worshipping, whether he is in the home, or the field, or the market-place. But the special form of the worship which attracts his attention is praise. Their great cry is a song, and there is no discord in it. Every person of every tribe has a voice and sings in harmony with all the rest.

What are these lovely ones, yea, what are these?
Lo, these are they who for pure love of Christ
Stripped off the trammels of soft silken ease,
Beggaring themselves betimes, to be sufficed
Throughout heaven's one eternal day of peace:
By golden streets, thro' gates of pearl unpriced,
They entered on the joys that will not cease
And found again all firstfruits sacrificed.
And wherefore have you harps, and wherefore palms,
And wherefore crowns, O ye who walk in white?
Because our happy hearts are chanting psalms,
Endless Te Deum for the ended fight;
While thro' the everlasting lapse of calms
We cast our crowns before the Lamb, our Might.

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI.

Two Notes on Religious Antiquities in Asia Minor.

By Professor Sir William M. Ramsay, D.C.L. LL.D., Litt.D., D.D., University of Aberdeen.

I.

Gaianus, Martyr at Ancyra of Galatia.

There remains much yet to be learned from an intelligent study of the Acta Martyrum. Some years ago in The Expository Times I pointed out that we have a record of the persecution under Trajan, and the exact date in the year when Hadrian was Proconsul of the Province Asia. The mention of Hadrian as Governor of Asia is the guarantee of trustworthiness; no falsifier would have omitted the opportunity of transforming his title from Proconsul to Emperor; and no one would remember that Hadrian governed the Province of Asia, an event recorded only on a coin of Thyatira struck under Trajan.

I shall now attempt to show that in a series of much corrupted entries under the dates 31 August and 4 September, we have the record of a martyrdom on a large scale under Domitian or Trajan or Hadrian at Ancyra. The subject came up in connexion with a Byzantine milestone found at Barata of Lycaonia, which was included in the Province Galatia until the latter part of Hadrian's reign. The critical text of the Hieronymian Martyrology, published by Monsignor Duchesne, makes the investigation possible. The undigested mass of material collected in vols. xl. and xlii. of the *Acta Sanctorum*, piled up in uncritical and unintelligent fashion, is absolutely valueless in this case; and nothing could be made of it.

In the early Syriac Martyrology (supposed to have been translated from a Greek original connected with Nicomedia) the following entries occur:—

31 August	4 September
in Ancyra Gilos martyr and six others.	in Ancyra Marcellus and eight others.

These are explained by the lists in the Hieronymian Martyrology: I neglect misspellings and variations in the MSS, taking the best form of each name.

Prid. Kal. Sept.	Prid. Non. Sept.
Ancyra Galatiae Gaiani	In Ancyra Galatiae Marcelli
Juliani Rufini Vincentii	Gaiani Helpidii Antonini
Silvani Italicae Antiquirae	Rufini Silvani Eustochii
Aemiliani Florentii Justae	Maximi Eusebii Gaiani
Juliae Anthimi Maximi &c.	Vitalicae Gaisuti &c.

Such long lists in the Martyrology have always undergone much corruption; and the most fruitful cause of corruption is double entry of a name which occurs elsewhere in the list of the day. Applying this principle we eliminate forthwith from the list of 31 August four names, Antiquirae (dittography of Ancyra), Juliae (dittography of Juliani), Florentii (dittography of Florentini later on this day), and Maximi (dittography of a Roman martyr later in the same day). Similarly, we cut out of the list of 4 September two names, Marcelli (dittography of a Gallic saint) and Maximi: we recognize also that the second Gaiani is an error for Juliani, and Antonini for Anthimi. Then comparing the two lists we see that Justae of 31 August is a corruption of Gaesuti. The latter name is a sign of good character; the proper form is Gaisati, genitive of a known Galatian name: Gaisatos means 'spearman,' and Gaisatorix (another known Galatian name), 'king of the spearmen' (*gaison*, a 'spear'). We may now go further in eliminating errors: Aemiliani on 31 August is apparently a dittography of Juliani-Anthimi, and Eusebii on 4 September is a commoner name substituted for the rare Eustochii.

We now see that the entries in the Syriac Martyrology are corrupted from a Greek version of similar lists, which had already suffered some corruption. On 31 August Gaianas has become Gilos in translating from Greek, on 4 September the intrusion of the false Marcellus had occurred already in the original, and thus the leading name Gaianus is hidden in the abbreviated form which the Syriac translator gives.

When these corrections are all made the lists appear as follows:—

1. Syriac Martyrology.

31 August	4 September
in Ancyra Gaianus martyr and six others.	in Ancyra Gaianus and seven others.

2. Hieronymian Martyrology.

Prid. Kal. Sept.	Prid. Non. Sept.
Ancyra Galatiae Gaiani	in Ancyra Galatiae
Juliani Rufini *Vincentii*	Gaiani *Elpidii* Anthimi
Silvani Italicae	Rufini Silvani *Eustochii*
Gaisati	Juliani
Anthimi.	Italicae Gaisati.

Seven names are common to both lists. We can hardly doubt that we have here two traditions of one list, Gaianus and many companions, who were martyred at Ancyra of Galatia. The double tradition evidently arose through a confusion in the Latin form of dating, *Prid. Kal. Sept.* and *Prid. Non. Sept.*; and therefore took place in a Latin form of the original record, which affords another proof of trustworthiness.

The differences, Vincentii in one case, Elpidii and Eustochii in the other, cannot at present be explained; but they do not detract from the historical character of the list. Possibly both forms may be abbreviations of a still longer list which included all these names and more.

Gaianus was the leading figure in a band of martyrs who suffered together at the capital of the province, probably in the arena, on the day of some great festival. The martyrs were doubtless gathered from many parts of the province, and tried before the Imperial Legate who governed Galatia. In a book entitled *The Thousand and One Churches*,[1] I have shown from the inscription on a late milestone that Barata, the site of the 1001 churches, took the name Gaianoupolis (as Aphrodisias was called Stauropolis; Prousa, Theopolis, etc.); and therefore Gaianus evidently came from that Lycaonian city. After Hadrian reorganized the south-eastern part of Asia Minor and founded the Triple Eparchy Cilicia-Lycaonia-Isauria, Gaianus would have been sent to Tarsus for trial, as happened to several martyrs from the neighbouring Lycaonian city of Laranda, whose memory was celebrated on 23 August (*Acta Sanctorum* for that day, p. 567).

A scene in one of the early persecutions is thus revealed. Possibly an account of the circumstances may hereafter be discovered in some manuscript. If we had any knowledge of a festival in Ancyra celebrated either on 31 August or 4 September, this would decide between the two days.

[1] Now in print, and shortly to be published.

II.

The Armed Priestesses in the Hittite Religion.

The interpretation of the great series of religious sculptures in the famous rock-sanctuary near the Hittite capital at Boghaz-Keui, in the northern part of the central plateau, depends largely on the view taken as to the sex of a number of armed warriors. In a paper published by the Royal Asiatic Society in 1882, and reprinted in *Luke the Physician and other Studies*, p. 203 f., I maintained that the figures of this class were female, and connected them with the frequent references in Greek literature to the existence of female warriors at the religious centres in Asia Minor. These female warriors appear in legend as the Amazons, against whom Priam, king of Troy, had in his youth fought on the banks of the Phrygian river Sangarios. Our view of the character of the religion depends, as I believe, largely on this matter. I regard it as a characteristic of that religion to raise itself above the distinction of sex, which is regarded as not an ultimate and real element of the divine life: the life of God was conceived as self-complete, self-sufficient, continuous, and superior to the distinction of male and female: the idea of death comes in along with the idea of sex and incompleteness.

The whole theory, though not disproved, for it has literary evidence to rest on, would certainly be inapplicable to those Hittite sculptures at Boghaz-Keui, if the figures which I interpreted as female are found to be male. I founded my view on the character of the features. The dress of the figures is like that of a soldier; they wear very short tunics; they have a martial, not to say a masculine, air; and the bosom is masculine in outline. But, if women are going to fight, they cannot wear the long trailing robes of their sex, but must dress like soldiers.

My view, however, was not held, so far as I know, by any previous, or accepted by any subsequent, traveller. Only my friend, the late Sir Charles Wilson, approved it; and, in fact, it was he who said, as we looked at the figures, that they were all women. Fortunately, a test case has now been discovered. A figure has been found sculptured on one of the doorposts at the east gate of the city: I presume it has recently been excavated, but cannot say with certainty if that is so. My friends, Dr. Dodds of the American Hospital at Kaisari, Mrs. Dodds, and Miss Dodds of the American College for Women at Scutari on the Bosphorus, have visited the site during the summer of 1909; and Miss Dodds has sent me a photograph of the figure. It is dressed like the disputed figures in the sculptures at the sanctuary, a warrior wearing the shortest of tunics, with the same martial and masculine air. Hence it has been described as a king, because it wears the high pointed hat of the Hittite kings. But the single figure at the outside of the gate should rather be considered as a guard than a king. The high pointed hat I regard as characteristic not of the king, but of the god and of his priests: the king wears it only because he is also the supreme priest. My friends, who are among the very few persons that have seen the figure, say that 'it is unmistakably a woman—an Amazon armed'; the photograph, though small, seems to confirm this opinion; but it is not a matter on which any doubt could remain in the mind of those who have looked at the original stone.

Those characteristics which formerly rendered my view doubtful must now be taken as proving that the explanation suggested was correct: the intention at the sanctuary was to confuse or obliterate the distinction of sex. So the mythology described the goddess with the character of a man, and the god as sometimes dressing himself as a woman and playing an effeminate part, an Omphale and a Heracles; while the priest of the religion must be neither male nor female.

In the Study.

A Study in the Atonement.

THREE years ago Dr. Horton named Herrmann's *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, Gwatkin's *Knowledge of God*, and the Rev. W. L. Walker's *Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism*, as the books of the year which had influenced him most. Professor Gwatkin and the Rev. W. L. Walker have again published their books together, and we shall not be surprised if again Dr. Horton singles them out from all the rest. Professor Gwatkin's book is noticed on another page. Mr. Walker's may be mentioned here. Its title is *The Gospel of Reconciliation, or At-one-ment* (T. & T. Clark; 5s.).

There is an opening chapter on 'The Gospel and the Cross.' Then the subject of the second chapter is 'Not Atonement, but At-one-ment.' For Mr. Walker recognizes that he can make no progress in his exposition of the Atonement until he has got rid of the modern meaning of the word. And yet Mr. Walker is experimentally evangelical, and a scholar.

It has often been pointed out that the word 'atonement' is used in modern theology in a sense quite different from that warranted by the New Testament. But this has been done most frequently in support of the idea that the reconciliation was wholly on the human side. Mr. Walker finds it necessary to show what is the meaning of the word in the New Testament in the interest of an evangelical conception of the Cross.

The word 'atonement' occurs only once in the Authorized Version of the New Testament—Ro 5^{11}, 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.' It does not occur in the Revised Version at all, 'atonement' in this place being turned into 'reconciliation.' The Greek word (καταλλαγή) occurs elsewhere in the New Testament, and wherever it occurs the English Versions render it 'reconciling' or 'reconciliation,' and there is no doubt whatever that that is the meaning of the word. Nor does the verb (καταλλάσσω) ever occur in any other sense. In 1 Co 7^{11} we read, 'Let her (the wife) be reconciled to her husband.'

Mr. Walker thinks it possible that the English word 'atonement' is used by the translators of the A.V. in the sense of reconciliation, although Dr. John Owen, writing not long after the time of the translation, says he does not know by what means this word has been translated 'atonement' (*Works*, x. 263). In any case, 'reconciliation' is the original meaning of the English word 'atonement,' as 'reconcile' is of the word 'atone.' Mr. Walker quotes three passages from Shakespeare:

> He and Aufidius can no more atone
> Than violentest contrariety.—*Coriol.* IV. vi. 72.
>
> I would do much
> To atone them, for the love I bear to Cassio.
> —*Othello*, IV. i. 244.
>
> He desires to make atonement
> Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers.
> —*Richard III.* I. iii. 37.

He finds other examples in *The Oxford English Dictionary*, one of the best being taken from Samuel Clarke, who, as late as 1650, says: 'We must not come to make an attonement with God . . . before we have made attonement with our Brother.'

How is it, then, that the word 'atonement' has come to signify expiation? Partly, says Mr. Walker, through the influence of Anselm's satisfaction theory, and partly from a mistaken conception of the meaning of the Old Testament sacrifices. A mistaken conception. For Mr. Walker does not believe that even in the Old Testament the word translated 'atone' or 'make atonement' means 'propitiate' or 'expiate.' It is the word *Kipper*, and *Kipper* simply means 'to cover.' The great passage in Lv 17^{11}, with reference to the blood, says simply, 'I have given it to you to cover your souls.' Mr. Walker agrees with Schultz that 'the idea of expiation has been put into the word "cover" without any justification.' What is stated is that the blood, being the seat of life and as such peculiarly holy (if not even Divine), *is given by God* to them as a covering in relation to certain offences, so that by offering it before Him in a prescribed way His people may continue in covenant relations with Him. The impossibility of 'atonement' meaning 'expiation' is evident to Mr. Walker from the fact that the atonement is always represented as proceeding from God.

All this is self-evident to some. It has yet to be

made self-evident to the multitude. Mr. Walker's delightful new book will go a long way towards making it so.

A Study in Translation.

The words are found in Jn 14^{1}—πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε.

Speaking of certain passages, of which this is one, Westcott says (*Lessons of the R.V.*, p. 29), 'The eloquent significance of the original order is untranslatable.' But it is not the order of the words that makes this a problem in translation, though there is something in that; it is the ambiguity in the form of the verbs. For πιστεύετε may be either 'ye believe' (indicative) or 'believe' (imperative). And so, as Erasmus pointed out long ago, there are four possible ways of it. The meaning may be (1) 'Ye believe in God, and ye believe in me'; or (2) 'Ye believe in God, believe also in me'; or (3) 'Believe in God, and believe in me'; or (4) 'Believe in God, and ye believe in me.'

Nor are the possibilities exhausted yet. There are at least two more ways in which the text may be translated. It is possible (5) to take the first verb interrogatively: 'Ye believe in God? Believe also in me'; and (6) if the punctuation of Westcott and Hort's margin is adopted—πιστεύετε, εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε—the translation would be: 'Believe,—believe in God and in me.'

Look at the last first.

It is given in the margin of Westcott and Hort's text as a 'secondary' reading, not being so well attested as the reading in the text. But Hort himself was greatly attracted by it. In his posthumously published *Commentary on 1 Peter* i. 1 *to* ii. 17, at the end of a note on πιστούς (1 P 1^{21}), he states without reserve that it is the most probable punctuation, translates the sentence, 'Believe, on God and on me believe,' and adds that there is a double suggestion in the words so punctuated, 'The first suggestion being of constancy opposed to troubling and fearfulness, and the second of the ground of that constancy, rest in God, itself depending on rest in Christ.' No version appears to have adopted this rendering, but Weymouth (*The N.T. in Modern Speech*) in a footnote says: 'The second half of Jn 14^{1} may be punctuated—"Trust: in God and in me, trust"'; and Rotherham (*The Emphasised N.T.*) has the footnote—'Or punctuate thus: Believe,— | on God and on me | believe.'

Take next the interrogative. This is Beza's rendering—'Ne turbator cor vestrum: creditis in Deum? etiam in me credite.' It is discussed by Edwin Abbott (*Johannine Grammar*, § 2236 ff.), though he does not notice Beza. Abbott points out that πιστεύετε has the interrogative sense in Mt 9^{28}, πιστεύετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, 'Believe ye that I am able to do this?' The translation of the verb here *might* be imperative, he says, and then it might be argued that the imperative is used by Jesus to stimulate their faith, as He stimulates that of Jairus, 'Be of good cheer, only believe' (Mk 5^{36}, Lk 8^{50}). But the answer of the blind men, 'Yea, Lord,' shows that the meaning is interrogative. It is either directly interrogative, 'Do ye believe?' or indirectly, 'Ye believe that I am able to do this?'

But Dr. Abbott admits that the usage of St. Matthew does not regulate the usage of St. John, and all he claims is that the interrogative sense in Jn 14^{1} is possible.

There remain the four alternatives of Erasmus.

1. Are the verbs both indicative?—'Ye believe in God, and ye believe in me.' This would most probably be their meaning in classical Greek, where the interrogative would be introduced by some adverb, and the imperative could be expressed unmistakably by the aorist (πιστεύσατε). But we have here to do with the language of the Gospels, which was the language of everyday life, not with classical idiom; and we have to observe the usage of the Fourth Gospel in particular.

Now, πιστεύετε is found in St. Matthew once (9^{28}), in St. Mark three times (1^{15} 11^{24} 13^{21}), not at all in St. Luke, but in St. John sixteen times (3^{12} $5^{38.47}$ 6^{36} $8^{45.46}$ $10^{25.26.37.38}$ 12^{36} $14^{1bis.11bis.31}$). The example in St. Matthew is interrogative, as we have already seen. The three examples in St. Mark are all imperative (the third with μή). Of the sixteen examples in St. John, seven are ordinary cases of narrative with οὐ, and another (8^{46}) is an interrogative introduced by διὰ τί. There remains 10^{37} (imperative with μή), 10^{38} (evidently an imperative also: 'Though ye believe not me, believe the works'), 14^{31} (an interrogative introduced by ἵνα τι), and three cases of πιστεύετε followed by εἰς (12^{36} 14^{11bis}), the only really apposite examples, and all unmistakably imperative. The remaining occurrences of πιστεύετε are the two in the verse

before us (14^1), and the natural conclusion would seem to be, that here also, in both cases, the verb is imperative: 'Believe in God, believe also in me.'

Erasmus says that St. Chrysostom favours the indicative, 'Ye believe in God, and ye believe in me'; but Abbott denies that Chrysostom's words demand the indicative; they are quite compatible with the imperative. His paraphrase is, 'All dangers shall pass you by, for faith in me and in my Father is more powerful than the things which come upon you, and will permit no evil thing to prevail against you.'

This first rendering, therefore, is usually set aside. There is a certain attraction in it; for the calm assurance of 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, and ye believe in me,' is in keeping with the tone of the context. But the linguistic usage is considered to be against it.

2. Is the first verb indicative and the second imperative?—'Ye believe in God, believe also in me.' This is the translation of the Vulgate ('Creditis in Deum, et in me credite'), of Erasmus, of Wyclif ('ye bileuen in to God, and bileue ye in to me'), and of Purvey's Revision ('ye bileuen in God, and bileue ye in me'), of Murdoch Nisbet ('ye beleue in God, and beleue ye in me'); not of Tindale, but of Coverdale, though he introduces a superfluous 'if' ('Yf ye beleue on God, then beleue also on me'); of the Great Bible, and the Genevan ('Ye beleue in God, beleue also in me'); of the Bishops' Bible, the Rhemish Version ('You beleeue in God, beleeue in me also'); of the Authorized and Revised Versions; and of the margin (only) of the American 'Standard' Version. It is the translation of Diodati ('voi credete in Dio, credete ancora in me'), and of the new French version of Abbé Crampon ('Vous croyez en Dieu, croyez aussi en moi').

This is a long list. But it is not overwhelming in authority. The surprise is the Revised Version. Many of the Revisers must have felt (even though it is possible that the majority of them preferred the imperative, which finds a place in their margin) that the usage of the Evangelist did not decide the question, but that the context had its claim for consideration. And on the face of it the sense of the context seems to demand that emphasis should be laid on the belief in Jesus. The disciples did surely believe in God. But in the near approach of the death of their Master, it is their faith in Him that seems to need encouragement.

And yet this translation has commended itself to scarcely any modern expositor.

3. Are both the verbs in the imperative then? 'Believe in God, believe also in me.' This is the translation of the Diatessaron and of three of the Old Latin versions. It is Luther's rendering and Tindale's ('beleve in God, and beleve in me'). It is Bengel's ('credite—credite'), who uses two arguments in its favour: first, that it corresponds with the previous imperative, 'Let not your heart be troubled'; and second, that Jesus uses the imperative here, and again in v.[11], until at last He is able to use the indicative in 16^{31}, whereupon He offers up His priestly prayer and departs. It is the rendering of almost all modern commentators and versions—of Godet, Westcott, Plummer, Bruce, Dods, Bernard, Maclaren; it is given in the margin of the Revised Version, in the text of the American 'Standard' Revision, in Rotherham, Weymouth, the *Twentieth Century New Testament*, Lloyd, and Weizsäcker.

But Olshausen questions it, and Olshausen is never to be neglected. 'If πιστεύετε is imperative in both instances, then,' he says, 'the position of εἰς ἐμέ is strange, since in that case these words should follow the second πιστεύετε instead of preceding it.' And he gives another reason. 'Faith in Christ,' he says, 'is never *added to* faith in God, but the object of faith is God in Christ.'

4. Is it possible, then, that the last of Erasmus's four ways—'Believe in God, and in me ye believe'—is the right way?

It is the translation in the Old Latin MS. known as *a*, the important *Codex Vercellensis*. It is also the translation of the Sinaitic Syriac, which Mrs. Lewis turns into English in this way: 'Believe in God, and in me ye are believing,' and remarks (in The Expository Times, xii. 419), 'The Syriac, we are glad to say, is not dubious.' Beza does not adopt this rendering, but he gives it a place in his note on the passage, saying, 'Vel, *Credite in Deum, et in me creditis*. Id est, Credite in Deum, quod si faciatis, eadem opera et in me creditis.' Olshausen finally decides in favour of it, though not emphatically. If, he says, we regard the first πιστεύετε as imperative and the second as indicative, the meaning would be: 'Believe in God, then will ye also believe in me.' And he adds, 'This interpretation may possibly be the most appropriate, since the very faith of the disciples in God wavered.' It is also the translation of at least one good modern

preacher, the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham, M.A., whose volume, entitled *The Writing on the Sky, and other Sermons* (Skeffington), has been the immediate occasion of the present study. Mr. Fotheringham has no hesitation whatever. 'There,' he says, 'plain before your eyes, with the most charming simplicity, with no idea of emphasis or contrast or grammatical complexity whatever, lies the wording of the Greek, the comfortable assurance of our Lord—Believe in God, and ye believe in me.'

A Study in Biography.

There are two ways of writing biography. The one way is to arrange the letters chronologically and sew them together with thin threads of narrative. The other is to write the biography as one would write a history, using the letters as one of the sources of it. These two ways are seen in their extreme form in the two biographies of any importance which have been most recently published. The one is the *Memoir of George Howard Wilkinson*, the biographer being Arthur James Mason, D.D. (Longmans; 2 vols., 28s. net). The other is *The Life of Principal Rainy*, by Patrick Carnegie Simpson, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 2 vols., 21s. net).

Each method has its advantages. Dr. Mason's method is the easier. But if the subject of the biography was a letter-writer; if he was accustomed to let himself go in his letters—some men deliberately write letters in prospect of their biography, but that is not necessary—if the letters reveal the man and are worth reading for their own sake, then the easier way is likely to be the better way. Mr. Simpson's is the more difficult and also the more dangerous way. He does not leave his readers to form their own estimate of Principal Rainy, they have to accept his estimate. And if his estimate is wrong, they are helpless. But if the biographer is intimate enough and has the ability, it is not only the most readable but it is the right way.

Bishop Wilkinson was not a great letter-writer. It is true that he had the great letter-writer's first requisite, he revealed himself in his letters. But his interests were too confined and his ability to express himself on paper too commonplace. The reader must first of all be thoroughly interested in Wilkinson himself before he begins to read his letters. And that is another way of saying he must have known the Bishop personally, for Dr. Mason does not give others that opportunity before he pours the letters upon them. The biography of Bishop Wilkinson, in short, is a biography for Bishop Wilkinson's own friends. No one will read it without enjoying it intensely; but only his friends will read it.

The Life of Principal Rainy has been written not for his friends' and brethren's sake, but undoubtedly and quite deliberately for his enemies. For it is not enough to say that it is a popular biography. Beyond the people, beyond even the uninterested outsider, Mr. Simpson has had in mind the Church of Scotland Established, the *Scotsman* newspaper, and the House of Lords. For many years of his life Dr. Rainy was identified with the Disestablishment Controversy. 'During this controversy (we quote Mr. Simpson's own words) he became the object of the most unsparing and, one must add, most unscrupulous personal attacks which any public man has had to bear in modern times. . . . On the plea that he did not base the Disestablishment movement on the ground of religious equality and secularism, the *Scotsman* set itself not merely to criticise his views and oppose the cause, but to belittle the man and to impute to him continuously nothing but the shabbiest motives. . . . Day by day the leader of the Free Church was held up to the people of Scotland as the meanest-motived of men and the worldliest of ecclesiastics.' Now, if Dr. Rainy had resented this and had expressed his resentment in letters, and if his biographer had quoted these letters, all would have belonged to the biographer's ordinary duty. But (we quote Mr. Simpson again) 'Principal Rainy never uttered a word of protest; while in private he never referred with anything but good humour to what he called "our friend the *Scotsman*."' It is just on that account that Mr. Simpson writes for the enemy. The method is dangerous, yet it does not seem as if on any occasion the danger had turned into disaster.

Dr. Mason follows the order of events in Wilkinson's ordinarily eventful life with equanimity. The interest is psychological throughout. Not that Wilkinson's personality was either very complex or very momentous. It was, however, a personality that developed, and often in unexpected directions. One of his colleagues at

Durham, the Rev. C. Green, in a letter to Dr. Mason, says: 'The one real and substantial change I can discover in the Wilkinson I worked with in Durham, and as he was known during all the later years of his life, was in regard to Church views. It is perhaps true that from the very first he would have been ready to let any one apply to him the classification Bishop Samuel Wilberforce is said to have adopted as applicable to his own case: "A High Churchman on an Evangelical basis." But both at Seaham and Auckland the "basis" was more in evidence than the superstructure. What the biographer will have to show is that, while the first remained unshaken to the very end, the latter underwent what almost amounted to a reconstruction.'

The most interesting moments in his life psychologically, at least so far as the biography reveals it, were this experience at Auckland under Bishop Baring, whose name was much too easily punned upon for his imperious character, and that dramatic moment when he stood before the General Assemblies of the two greatest Churches in Scotland and requested that a day might be set apart for universal prayer on behalf of union. Both occasions were probably bad for him. What Bishop Baring may have meant for discipline could not have done him good, his aim was too single and his self-discipline more than sufficient. And the other occasion ended still more evidently in disappointment and probably left still greater soreness. For again, Bishop Wilkinson was not the man for it, though for a time it seemed as if he were the very ideal. 'From to-day's proceedings,' says one of his friends, 'I see better what old Canon Bruce meant when he said that the Bishop has "an iron will." Whenever he is satisfied that a certain course is the right one, which he ought before God to take, then nothing matters; along that road he will go straight, whatever he has to encounter; he takes it with no more hesitation than he would eat his dinner.' He seemed at first ideal; he was so eager for union and so unworldly. But he was already satisfied that a certain course was the right one. 'It is to be feared,' says his biographer, 'that some of those with whom he had to do began to feel that he was more unyielding in his attitude than at first they had hoped.'

The Life of Principal Rainy is more than a biography. It is a history of the Free Church of Scotland from 1843 to 1900, and of the United Free Church of Scotland from 1900 to 1906. It has been written to be read. It has been written as a work of art. Mr. Simpson shows no nervous fear that his readers will drop behind him before the journey's end, yet he does not disdain the use of means to retain them. As he closes the story of the union between the Free Church and the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, a union which was accomplished in 1876, he deftly whirls his readers into an expectation of the Robertson Smith Controversy, which is to occupy the following chapters. 'This union was a notable public event. Yet, if one surveying the Free Church of Scotland at that time could have been gifted with the eyes of a seer, what would have most keenly arrested one's gaze would have been not the Assembly Hall with its crowded benches, but a small room in a street in Aberdeen, where, surrounded by volumes of mediæval, Oriental, and modern learning, a young professor, pale with too constant study, was steeping his mind in the latest criticism of the Old Testament Scriptures.' This dramatic artifice he uses once and again, the most effective occasion, perhaps, being after the passing of the Declaratory Act, when by means of it he throws the interest of his reader forward all the way to the judgment of the House of Lords.

It is a biography that has been written to be read; and it will be read—by friend and enemy and the man in the street. What will be the effect of it? This will be one effect of it, that the saintliness of Principal Rainy's character will at last be recognized, recognized by friend and enemy and the man in the street.

But this is only a study in biography, and for the present we have said enough.

Love.

By Professor the Rev. James Denney, D.D., Glasgow.

'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing' (1 Co 13^{1-3}).

The persons to whom these words were addressed were full of what may be called Christian ambitions. They coveted what they reckoned Christian gifts; the Church of Christ was for them a stage on which they aspired to be conspicuous figures. The Apostle has their correction in view when he writes, 'Covet earnestly the best gifts, and yet show I unto you a more excellent way.' It is literally a way in the superlative degree—*via maxime vialis*, as Bengel renders it—a way having in perfection all the qualities which ought to characterize a way; a way open to every one, unobstructed, leading straight to the goal of Christian greatness. This is the way of love which he proceeds to celebrate.

It has been finely remarked that the Apostle illustrates in his very first words the lesson he wishes to teach: 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love.' An unloving spirit would have said, 'Though you speak with the tongues of men and of angels,' and made the Corinthians, not himself, represent the bad example. The instinctive courtesy of the Apostle is inspired by love, and shows how thoroughly he himself has learned his lesson. The simplest way in which we can enter into his thought is to make clear to ourselves what the gifts are which are sometimes supposed to supersede love, but which really depend upon it for their value in the Church.

The gift of tongues was an emotional gift. It was an ecstasy of feeling by which men were carried away and broke into rapturous inarticulate utterances. The sublime realities of the Christian faith—God, Christ, the forgiveness of sins, the assurance of immortality—as they broke into the common life of man, disturbed its equilibrium profoundly. Nature rocked under the impact of the supernatural as a boat rocks on the water when a heavy weight is suddenly thrown into it. This emotional disturbance, though in some ways incalculable, seems always to have had one character. It was an ecstasy of praise. Those who were carried away by it uttered in this transport of feeling the wonderful works of God. What they expected when the impetus had subsided was an Amen at their giving of thanks. A modern musician has written songs without words: this is a very apt description for the peculiar kind of spiritual emotion called in the New Testament speaking with tongues. Probably the nearest approach to it most Christians make is when they are carried away by the feeling of a revival meeting. Many can still remember the revival of 1874, when Mr. Moody first came to this country. Like most revivals it lived in an atmosphere of praise: the first edition of Mr. Sankey's *Sacred Songs and Solos* came along with it, and the American Organ. Everybody sang these hymns and sang them everywhere. The largest churches and halls were crowded out for months by multitudes surrendering themselves to the emotion. The words and the tunes—perhaps in some cases the tunes even more than the words—sang themselves into people's ears, into their very nerves and brain. They heard the rhythm of them through the beating of machinery or the noisy traffic of the streets. They heard it as they sat over their Bibles at home. They felt like singing all the time. The church was full of men who floated, so to speak, on this wave of emotion; an unutterable joy in the redeeming love of God seemed to sustain their life; it was full, as they would have said in the early days, of people speaking with tongues.

This is an experience which many make light of and even deprecate; they do not speak with tongues, and they do not want to. But this is not how it is regarded by the Apostle. He knew as well as any modern moralist that the promise of the new emotion is not always fulfilled. He knew that the equilibrium of the old nature which had been momentarily disturbed by the sense of Christian realities was too easily restored at the old level, and that men who had spoken

with tongues might relapse and become 'sensual, not having the Spirit.' But in itself this emotional susceptibility to spiritual realities is good. 'I thank my God,' says the Apostle, 'that I speak with tongues more than you all'; I am more open than any of you to this access of feeling which rises to unintelligible rapture. No one who has had in a time of revival the experience described above, no one who feels his heart beat quicker and his sympathies kindle as the refrain of a gospel hymn takes possession of his ear and his soul, will disagree with him. But good as this emotional susceptibility is, gift of God as it is, it is not good if it terminates in itself. It is not good if a man boasts of it, and judges on the strength of it those whose experience he does not appreciate and cannot understand. The ecstatic praise which is exhausted in utterance, the feeling which is exhausted in being felt, is in one aspect a kind of self-indulgence. It cannot be the be-all and the end-all of the gospel. Taken by itself, it is no more than sounding brass or clanging cymbal, those deafening empty noises with which the Corinthians were familiar even in pagan worship. It is not the steam which is blown off with a loud noise, and is visible for a moment in dense white clouds, which drives the engine; it is the steam in the boiler, which is subject to intense pressure, and is neither heard nor seen. Thank God for every Christian emotion, the Apostle says, but ask earnestly, persistently, and devoutly how it is to tell for the common good. 'The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every one *to profit withal*,' and the question on which everything turns is: What service is being done, by these prized exaltations of mine, to the Church which is the body of Christ? For what ministries of love do they furnish the driving power?

From emotional the Apostle advances to intellectual gifts: 'Though I have prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge.' I say 'advances' intentionally, for this is what he means. The uncontrollable emotion called speaking with tongues is no doubt a spiritual gift, when it is Christian realities which stimulate it, but it is the most elementary of spiritual gifts. It is the new life, indeed, but in a turbid semi-sensuous form—a form which is transcended when the Christian realities not only excite emotion but take possession of intelligence. It is not only inevitable but right that they should do so, and do it with decisive power. The world with Christ and redemption in it—the world in which the Son of God and the forgiveness of sins and eternal glory are real things—is another world. It makes another appeal to the intelligence, excites other reflexions, demands other interpretations, reveals other prospects. All former philosophies are cashiered when the realities of the Christian revelation come within the horizon of thought. The intellect which submits to the impact of the gospel receives a shock as startling and momentous as that which raises the emotions to ecstasy; the mind of man is born again under the supreme revelation of God. It gets an understanding of the world and of all God's ways with it and purposes in it undreamt of before. As St. Paul says here, it gets the gift of prophecy, and all mysteries and all knowledge are thrown open to it.

Probably no one ever had a more vivid experience of this than the writer of this Epistle. If any man ever had his mind born again and his world made new in a great experience it was he. The enthusiasm, the intoxication, as it has been called, of the great speculative geniuses like Plato and Spinoza who have tried to set this unintelligible world in an intelligible light before our eyes, is cold compared to the ardour with which Paul reconstructs his universe with Christ for its A and Ω, its principle and goal. 'In Him,' he has the exaltation of mind to write, 'were all things created, that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and in him all things are one.' The man who was capable of thinking and saying this did not undervalue the intellect and its use in the Christian life. He felt it essential even to his self-respect to have a Christian view of God and the world, a Christian philosophy or theology; he felt the value of being initiated into the ultimate truth, of seeing the world in divine Christian light —for that is what is meant by having 'prophecy, mysteries, and knowledge'; but he felt also that no attainments in this direction touched the centre any more than the emotional excitement of tongues Without love, to make the intellectual Christian the servant of the ignorant; without love, to keep the intellectual from being wise in his own conceit; without love, to check the intellectual when he is tempted to despise others, to restrain him when

he would use his power to intimidate others or to establish a selfish ascendency over them, knowledge is nothing. All mysteries may be open to a man —he may have the profoundest insight into the manifold wisdom of God—he may see the meaning, the methods, the issues of God's working in the world in a way which makes darkness light and crooked things straight; but without love, it does not count.

Most Christians, probably, at some time or other, have touched experimentally on speaking with tongues, but one cannot be so sure about prophecies and mysteries and knowledge. The daring of New Testament thought in its interpretation of all things in the light of Christ can hardly be said to survive in the Church. A great philosophical theologian, a man who could search with the light of revelation the world known to us as Paul searched and read with the same light the world known to his generation, is one of the crying wants of the time. What we have to lament is not that people overvalue knowledge in comparison with love, or that they set too much store on Christian insight into the meaning and purpose of the world, but that they have no interest at all in the intellectual construction and application of Christianity. Their minds have not been sufficiently stimulated by the Christian revelation to want any new view of the world in the light of it. But extremes meet, and the lesson of the Apostle at this point is curiously applicable to a kind of petrified intellectualism which is to be found in all churches. There are always those to whom Christianity is pre-eminently a kind of knowledge, a system of truth, or rather of truths. It means the truth of the Bible, or of the creed, or of some outline of Christian ideas on which they have been brought up. They have a zeal for this, and they are moved by what calls it in question as they are by nothing else. The ideal Christian for them is the defender of the faith, Mr. Valiant for the Truth. It does not perhaps occur to them that this is the type of intellectualism which is most likely to be loveless. But much as he admired the character, Bunyan knew its perils when he told how Mr. Valiant for the Truth was assailed by *Wildhead*, *Inconsiderate*, and *Pragmatical*. What a figure these rogues would cut in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. The curious thing is that the intellectual Christian, or rather the man who champions a truth which is no longer living but only in possession of legal authority, is apt to imagine that they are allies, not enemies, and that he can enlist them all to fight the Lord's battle. They are in reality the vices, and how often the unconsciously cherished vices, of the degenerate intellectual without love.

The Apostle becomes more venturesome and paradoxical as he goes on to ever higher gifts. 'Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing.' Faith here is not used in the general sense of that trust in Jesus which makes a man a Christian; it is a specific spiritual gift operating not on the emotional, nor on the intellectual, but on the practical side of human nature. It is the gift which raises Christian efficiency to a high point. The consequences of inefficiency are so miserable and depressing that it is no wonder this gift is highly valued. What is of so much value to the Church as that it should have men in it who in spite of obstacles can do what needs to be done, not men who say what they ought to say, and then nothing happens, but men who positively achieve things, men who overcome the difficulties at which others helplessly gaze? If any one prized this practical Christian efficiency it was Paul, who was a conspicuous illustration of it himself, and who often sought it in vain in his associates, yet not even this is the vital thing in the Christian life. We can almost think that as he wrote these words about the power of faith Paul had in his mind, not only the saying of Jesus about bidding the mountain remove and be cast into the sea, but the solemn words at the close of the Sermon on the Mount: 'Many shall say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many mighty works?' It might well seem incomprehensible that spiritual powers should be wielded, and spiritual efficiency in a supreme degree exhibited, by men whom Jesus rejects; but Paul felt the truth that was in it, and so may we. The efficient man may lose himself in his very efficiency; the sense may steal upon his mind that *he* is the really powerful preacher, that his is the commanding personality to which reluctant circumstances yield, his the practical capacity which gets the belt upon the wheel and transmits force and sees that work is done; and when this happens, all is lost. For Christianity is not in this region of outward efficiency after all; it is in the soul. A man may

be a great Christian worker, as we say, and no saint. He may do distinguished service to the Church, and have neither part nor lot in the kingdom of God. He may be one of those who at their departure are celebrated, mourned, and honoured by the Church, but to whom the Lord says, I never knew you. These are terrible things to say, and to think, but when we are dealing with love, we are always on the verge of terrible things. What can be so terrible as to wound love, and how can love be wounded more terribly than by offering any doings or achievements as a substitute for it?

Emotional gifts, intellectual gifts, practical gifts, all are vain without love. Even the gift which most nearly counterfeits love is vain also. 'Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing.' There, we might say again, are the very things we can conceive the Apostle doing himself; he was always forward to care for the poor; he died daily at his work. Certainly he did not undervalue the capacity for sacrifice or the practice of it; but he is putting an extreme case, and where sacrifice, even the utmost, is made (as it may conceivably be made) from ostentation or ambition, it profits nothing. There might even be a rivalry in philanthropy: who could think that the life of Christianity lay there?

And so we are driven back by the Apostle to the more excellent way—the way which *is* a way, and along which we can really make Christian progress. Emotion has its value when excited by Christian realities—so has intellect—so has energy—so has sacrifice; but the one thing needful is love. It is only when love rules the use of gifts, and indeed compels us to use them for the common good, that they can properly be called Christian. And what is love? A great theologian has defined it as the identification of ourselves with God's interest in others. God *has* an interest in others. There is something in all men which is dear to Him, to which His love is pledged, which it would grieve Him to see injured or frustrated. Do we realize this, and that the question whether we love or not can only be answered in the light of it? Do we realize it in regard to those who are nearest and dearest to us—our brothers and sisters, our sons and daughters? Do we realize it in regard to those who are members of the same congregation with us, or of the same social circle? Is there anything in our life which would not be there but for the sense we have of God's interest in others? Could we point to any one to whom we have ever shown the kindness of God for Jesus' sake? This is the only thing which is love in the Christian sense of the term. It is by this the Church and the Christian live, and without it they die. To identify ourselves with God's interest in the lives of others, to seek that God's will for them may be fulfilled, that that which is dear to Him in them may be saved, to put what we are and have unselfishly at their service for this end: this is love. Is there any such good thing found in us toward God and those who are dear to Him?

Now what the theologian defined, the Apostle describes. He pictures for us in a glow of enthusiasm the modes in which love manifests itself in a world like ours. No doubt when he wrote his description of love he had in his mind those phenomena in the Corinthian Church which made its absence sensible, but the same phenomena are always reappearing, and we find the key to his picture nearer home. 'Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.' Is there anything in us, when the contemplation of this picture has made us penitent, which can claim any kinship with it? It is not our likeness, we know that; but is there something in us which draws us inevitably and instinctively towards it, which makes us feel that it should be our likeness, and that it would be, if we yielded to the constraint of the love of God? If there is even this that remains, let us strengthen it and not suffer it to die. The greatest part of our perfection, as Robert Bruce says, is to thirst for perfection—to look on this picture with humble longing hearts till we begin to grow like it.

But we ought not to say, 'to look on this picture.' For what the theologian defines and the Apostle depicts is illustrated and embodied in our Lord Himself, and what we have to do is to look at Him. 'Herein is love.' We do not know what love is till we see it in Jesus, and when we see it there we see Him identifying Himself with God's interest in us. The revelation is not only

made before our eyes, it is made with special reference to ourselves. In Christ's presence we are not the spectators of love only, we are its objects. Christ exhibits towards men, He exhibits towards us, that wonderful goodness which Paul describes. When we think what our life has been, and what has been His attitude to us from first to last, do we not say, 'Our Lord suffers long, and is kind; He is not easily provoked; He does not impute to us our evil. Where we are concerned, where God's interest in us is concerned, He bears all things, He believes all things, He hopes all things, He endures all things'? These are the thoughts, or rather these are the experiences, out of which love is born in our hearts. We love, because He first loved us. All the time it is His love which must inspire ours. 'Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love.'

Theology and History.

By Professor the Rev. J. G. Tasker, D.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham.

At the last Congress of Historians, held in Berlin, the demand for the secularization of historical research found expression. In the name of Science it was urged that the solution of the problems of history would be hastened by the elimination of the factor, God. In his Rectoral Address,[1] Professor Erich Schaeder, of Kiel, essays to answer the question suggested by the utterances of some of the Berlin *savants*: 'Is it possible to understand history without God?' The secularization of history would mean, as he rightly perceives, the opening of a great gulf between theology and history. For it is on the manifestations of God in history, and especially on the historical revelation of God in Christ, that the vitality of theology depends.

The gravity of the issues raised by the claim advanced in the interests of the science of history is manifest. Of this fact Professor Schaeder's timely and impressive address will convince all its readers; it will also, we venture to think, prove that the claim cannot be allowed, and that the reasons for its rejection are scientific. Into its terse sentences so much thought is packed that it is difficult to summarize the argument without doing injustice to it. An attempt will, however, be made to indicate the strategic points in this powerful apologetic.

Many so-called theologies, we are reminded at the outset, are not theology at all. Theology proper is more than the conviction that theology is necessary, and more than the wish for a theology. The desire for a theology may be awakened by studying states of consciousness and by reflecting on the judgments of conscience. But as theology cannot be reduced to metaphysical speculation which infers the existence of the Absolute from a contemplation of the world-process, so neither can theology be discovered by searching in the depths of one's own soul for the mystical connexion of the individual life with an incomprehensible, vaguely defined Universal Life. Theology finds evidences of the action of the Living God in the objective domain of history; that is to say, in history which is definitely and indissolubly linked with the course of Nature. Theology finds that God is a reality in the region where reality is accessible to all. Not that God is brought in as a last resort and postulated as an explanation when finite causes are insufficient, but that historical study confronts us with facts and series of facts, of whose origin, course, and effects thought can give no rational account apart from God.

Nevertheless, Professor Schaeder is not surprised that in scientific circles there has arisen a demand for the secularization of history. As a scientific theologian he remembers that the thought of God has sometimes acted as a restraint on the legitimate inquiries of the scientific historian. Men's own share in the direction of the course of events may be underestimated or neglected, when undue prominence is given to the Divine factor. For example, the theory of the verbal inspiration of Holy Scriptures exerted a detrimental influence on the study of the Bible as literature. In fairness

[1] *Theologie und Geschichte.* Rede beim Antritt des Rektorats der Königlichen Christian-Albrechts-Universität, gehalten von Professor Erich Schaeder, 1909. Kiel: Lipsius und Tischer.

to those whose demand he is opposing, Professor Schaeder also frankly acknowledges that much progress may be made in historical research on purely secular lines. But he insists that the scientific historian encounters phenomena from the consideration of which, if he is true to his own principles, the thought of God cannot be excluded. On the other hand, the first duty of the scientific theologian is neither to formulate a 'view of the world' in which all things in heaven and in earth shall have a place, nor to search the universe to discover if anywhere there be footprints of God. Attention ought, first of all, to be fixed on those definite historical events which compel the earnest student to come to some decision regarding God. The light thus gained will help him in his further endeavour to understand the world of reality, as a whole and in all its parts.

The central event in history is the appearance of Jesus Christ. Theologians cannot, like Mommsen, pass by in silence the origin of Christianity and its immediate effect upon the world. Some try to include Christ in the category of humanity. He is represented as a man distinguished by His religious bearing; what He has accomplished in history is said to be due to the attractive power of His moral personality. (Yet there are those who would substitute 'repellent' for 'attractive.') According to this view, Jesus is a creative genius in the sphere of religious life; and if this be a correct presentation of the historic Jesus, His personality can be explained without saying that God was in Him.

What then does historic science say of Him? It reminds us—and with propriety—that for our knowledge of Him we depend almost entirely upon writings which resemble confessions of faith in Him. Professor Schaeder replies—and with equal propriety—that it is a perversion of the historic truth to speak as though the Evangelists built castles in the air. Prejudice has no right to raise a mist which distorts the historic figure. 'The New Testament writers, without exception, regard themselves as bound by their faith to steadfast, objective facts of history. . . . Just because they know how great, how bold, how hitherto unheard of is their faith, and just because they are conscious of their responsibility as they hand it down by tradition, they lay the whole emphasis on the facts comprised in the more or less complete historical material which warrants and determines their attitude towards Christ.'

In studying the historic data, as found, for example, in the Synoptic Gospels, we learn not only what other people said of Christ, but also what He thought of Himself. Men's judgments about Him are historically linked with His judgments about Himself; moreover, the witness of His self-consciousness is confirmed by what we learn of His inner life and His outward demeanour, as well as by what we know of His influence upon others and of His gracious deeds. When this witness is rejected, it is rejected, as Professor Schaeder points out, not on historic, but on dogmatic grounds. 'Christ stands before us in history with a unique consciousness of power.' He claims to have authority over the human will, and to be able to deliver men from the slavery of self-seeking. The sources of His inner life are found in His unique relationship to God; His humility springs not from His sense of sin, but from His consciousness of exposure to temptation.

Passing to the consideration of the influence of Christ, not only upon His contemporaries, but also upon subsequent generations, Professor Schaeder proceeds to examine the evidence for the historicity of the Resurrection of Jesus. For the purpose of his argument he is content to affirm (1) that historical inquiry into the trustworthiness of the narratives has failed to show that an event, confessedly unprecedented, cannot be included in the world of historic reality; and (2) that no decision can be come to on purely psychological grounds. This is one of those central events in history in regard to which it is impossible to say beforehand that the problems it presents to our mind can be solved without the factor God. No theory has accounted for the Resurrection-faith apart from the Resurrection-fact; the scientific historian can make this affirmation with a good conscience. 'No one can justly maintain that the historic testing of the narratives has led to the relegating of the fact itself to the region of enthusiastic fiction.'

If history is to be interpreted without God, what account can be given of the historic Jesus, of His self-consciousness, of His influence, and, above all, of His resurrection? It is obvious that to secularize history is to prejudge the main question at issue. If natural causation be the all-sufficing explanation, the personality of Jesus must be compressed into the limitations of human

categories. The historian may attempt to do this, but he does not possess, and he cannot therefore furnish, any guarantee that in ruling out the thought of God he has not excluded the *vera causa*. One thing, however, is certain: if the true explanation has been rejected, it is not because the principles of historic science have necessitated the rejection, but because the method of procedure has been dogmatic, albeit negatively dogmatic.

In the latter part of his address Professor Schaeder refers to three different schools in modern theology and to their differing treatment of the historical problems he has been investigating:

1. There are theologians who yield to the demand for the secularization of history, not because they disbelieve in God, but because they hold that history, including Christ, can be explained on principles of natural evolution. They speak of causes immanent in the world, but they are not, of necessity, pantheists. God is regarded as working within the limits prescribed by natural law. But so long as the historic Jesus, although truly man, is acknowledged to be more than man, so long as history bears witness to His redeeming power, so long as His resurrection is historically credible, who shall say that this theory, instead of helping us to understand historic reality, is not offering us mere phantasies, whether attractive or otherwise? Historians and theologians alike who adopt this attitude towards Christ are dogmatists, not scientists. Their dogmatic position is exposed to the assaults of historic science, not to speak of other objections.

2. The secularization of history is not opposed by Kantian theologians who distinguish sharply between theology and science, but contend that history must be studied from a theological as well as from a scientific point of view. It is granted that, under certain conditions, different conclusions may be drawn from the same historical data. For example, the theologian may have reasons for forming an estimate of the personality of Christ, essentially different from the secularizing historian, who cannot but regard Him as a product of natural evolution. Professor Schaeder reminds us that although our physiological heart has two chambers, the 'heart' of man—when the word is used as a synonym for personality—is a unity. Two essentially different answers to historic questions are impossible, when our attitude towards them will affect our entire inner life. From many quarters objections are raised to-day against this theory, which is that of the older Ritschlian school. Its concessions cannot be justified as the requirements of historical science, and it reverts to the old and useless distinction between knowledge and faith.

3. Another course may be taken by the theologian who has no desire to hinder the historian in the conduct of investigations which may legitimately be undertaken without introducing the thought of God as a factor into the reckoning. When history leaves the study of statistics, chronology, etc., and propounds a naturalistic explanation of all historical phenomena, including Christ, theology has a right to say, as it inspects the products of the historian's loom, that he has been weaving with dogmatic threads. Theology can respect secularized history only when it keeps strictly within its own proper sphere. History need not be unwilling sometimes to say *non liquet*,—to acknowledge that, having granted to scientific criticism of the sources its full rights, justice cannot be done to historical evidence without coming to terms with the thought of God. Theology can then enter by the door left open, its task being to show cause for the recognition of God in history, and to answer questions concerning what God is able and willing to do—questions which even historical science cannot escape.

In concluding, Professor Schaeder declares that his main purpose has been to expose the fallacies which underlie the assumption that historical science builds on the firm ground of reality, whilst theology erects castles in the air. The history of religion—much more the history of Christianity—confronts the student with an alternative that must be faced. Either the science of history must include, as it has often done, theological elements; or, if history be secularized, theology must be regarded as an indispensable supplement to, or complement of, history. To strive to explain the world of historic reality without having recourse to the thought of God is to pass from the domain of science to that of dogma. Theology lives on history; apart from history, theology is psychological, and perhaps metaphysical, phantasy. It is true that religion is life and furnishes theology with subject-matter. But this life does not revolve around man as its centre. The life of religion, on which theology depends, proceeds from God, who has made Himself known in historic facts.

Literature.

GWATKIN'S EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY TO A.D. 313. By Henry Melvill Gwatkin. (*Macmillan*. Two Vols. 17s. net.)

PROFESSOR GWATKIN'S History of Early Christianity has been long in coming. The time has certainly seemed long to those who knew it was on the way, and have been looking for it. But it is well for the histories of other men.

A professor of botany must be a botanist. A professor of theology has to be a theologian. Yet it does not seem necessary that a professor of ecclesiastical history should be an ecclesiastic. For there never was a better teacher of Church history than Professor Gwatkin, and there never was less of a Church politician. No party claims him. He is placed on no ecclesiastical commissions of inquiry. He has never been offered a bishopric. But he teaches and writes the history of the Church better than all other men in his own, or perhaps any other, country in our day.

Professor Gwatkin has become quite popular now as a writer. This is due to his Gifford Lectures on 'The Knowledge of God.' There is no risk in saying that that book takes the first place among Gifford Lectures. When the University of Edinburgh invited Professor Gwatkin north, few of the crowd who listen to lecturers had ever heard his name, and fewer still knew how to spell it. But that invitation re-established the Gifford Lectureship, and at the same time showed an astonished world that Christianity had still something substantial to say for itself. Men were amazed to find that a professor of ecclesiastical history could write the English language better than a Macaulay, could reach the springs of human emotion more certainly than a Carlyle, and could place his subject within the range of the sciences more securely than a Darwin. Even to men who knew him well by name, Professor Gwatkin's Gifford Lectures on 'The Knowledge of God' were as the discovery of a new writer of the first order, and the beginning of a new era in the exposition of the Christian faith.

The History of Early Christianity, having the Gifford Lectures in front of it, will be received without hesitation. If it is not the occasion of a surprise so glad as the other book, if it does not so definitely mark an epoch in one's intellectual or spiritual life, that is not because its merits are less. There is no falling away from the felicity of wording, the flame of imagination, the patience of gathered fact. Just as surely as the Gifford Lectures take their place in the expositions of Christianity, this book will take the foremost place in the history of its earliest years.

We quote one paragraph.

'Origen was beyond comparison the greatest scholar and the greatest teacher of his time. If Clement was the father of Christian literature, Origen was the first who systematically surveyed the vast field and set the problems and traced the lines of future work on exegesis, dogmatics, and homiletics. The Eastern writers did very little that had not been sketched out by Origen. Yet his mere learning, vast as it was, by no means forms his highest qualification, for there is something that must rank even higher than his subtle intellect and marvellous fertility of thought. No man since Plato had formed a nobler conception of education. It was not for Origen either the battle of empty declamation and idle sophistry the Greeks so often made it, or the undigested mass of marketable information which seems the modern fashion, but a systematic training of all the mental powers for the highest of all studies. Like Socrates, he thought it more important to root out prejudices and clear up confusions of thought than to communicate as many facts as possible. He believed, like Clement, though with a clearer perception than Clement, not only that all truth in heaven and earth comes from Christ and leads up to Christ, but that the fulness of human nature is needed to reach the fulness of truth, and that the fulness of truth is needed to reach the fulness of Christ. No doubt his conception of human nature was debased alike by Greek intellectualism and by the ascetic ideals of his time. But this means only that he was a man of his own age, and could not shake off all its limitations. Even Plotinus fared worse, though he is the greatest of Greek thinkers after Aristotle. At all events, Origen was one who strove to bring learning in its widest range to

bear upon the work of training all the faculties of human nature.'

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.

THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE. By Tilmann Pesch, S.J. (*Sands & Co.* 16s.)

The author of this book was born at Cologne in 1836, and died at Valkenburg in the Netherlands in 1899. He spent most of his life in Holland, lecturing on Philosophy, first at Maria-Laach, and then at Blijenbeck. He wrote many books. This was the last he wrote. It was rushing rapidly into a large circulation when he passed away. The translation has been made from the fifth edition.

It is a complete treatise on Christianity—its theology, its philosophy, and its ethics. But how can we believe that it has been so successful? The translation is good and the meaning is never mistakable. But there is no point at which it seems to catch on to an English mind. Is it possible that the features of men's minds differ more than the features of the countries they live in?

First of all there is the quaint but meaningless division of the work into 'Weeks'—four Weeks in all, as if the book were meant for a month's reading. If it is not read in less than a month it will not be read in a year. Then there is the introduction of so many subjects that are far away from our ordinary interest. 'Be cautious in thy daily intercourse with men. In every heart of man there lurks a foe; let it but master thee, and it will turn thine own weaknesses to account against thee.' The author is not afraid of apparent contradiction. On another page he says: 'It is the good in another, and not the evil, of which I must first take count. There is more good in many a man than he is able to lay bare to others.'

But not only are the subjects unfamiliar. Familiar subjects are often handled unfamiliarly. We search for the author's account of the Kingdom of God. We find it under the title of the Kingdom of Christ—three pages about the Kingship of Christ in the heart of man.

Is it the country, after all, that makes it all so far away, or is it the religion? As the ways of a Jesuit are not our ways, is it possible that his thoughts also are not our thoughts? And yet we have found nothing unworthy of the mind that is in Christ.

The Books of the Month.

Why is it that scarcely anybody can tell the difference between poetry and verse? Reviewers of books, regular reviewers even in our very best literary papers, who express their mind with confidence on any volume of prose submitted to them, become hesitating and hopeless the moment a volume of poems is put into their hands. It is due to the fact that they have had no education in poetry. Some men may know what poetry is instinctively, but most men have to be educated in this as in anything else.

Professor Macdonald Alden, of Leland Stanford Junior University, has written *An Introduction to Poetry* (Bell; 5s.), the purpose of which is to teach men to know poetry when they see it, and to appreciate it. It is a book for students, and must be studied if it is to do any good. But it is a study that takes less out of one than usual, there is so much good poetry quoted in it, poetry that is made all the better by its setting.

The Prayer Book Version of the Psalms is not so intelligible as the Authorized Version, and their constant repetition does not make them more intelligible. What then? Does it provide some imaginative substitute for intelligibility? Or does it strengthen the desire that some one would come with a more intelligible version of the Psalms, or else with a commentary on this version?

A few years ago Professor Driver came with a more intelligible version. Canon J. G. Carleton, D.D., has now come with a commentary. Dr. Carleton has come with an introduction to the Psalter, and with marginal notes on each of the Psalms. He has printed the Psalms in one column, and his notes in another beside them. Thus as the Psalm is read the meaning of every old English word, of every obscure phrase, and of every wrong translation is seen at a glance. The Psalm can be read with the old devoutness of spirit and with a new joy of understanding. The title of the book is *The Prayer Book Psalter* (Cambridge Press; 4s. net).

The great Hobbes scholar in this country was the late Mr. W. G. Pogson Smith. If he had lived to give us the result of his studies, Hobbes might have recovered the place in popular opinion which he has so unaccountably lost. But the

delegates of the Clarendon Press have done their best. They have reprinted Hobbes's *Leviathan* from the edition of 1651, and introduced it by an essay on the position of Hobbes in Philosophy which they found amongst the materials which Mr. Pogson Smith left behind him (2s. 6d. net).

It is an instructive essay, and outspoken that it may be instructive. What will the Shakespeare-Baconians say when they read that 'Hobbes's writing is just as decisively superior to Bacon's, as his philosophy? Bacon aimed at concealing the poverty of his thought by the adornment of his style: he wrote for ostentation. When that solemn humbug, that bourgeois Machiavel took up his pen to edify mankind, he first opened his commonplace books, stuffed with assorted anecdotes, quotations, conceits, and *mucrones verborum*, and then with an eye to the anthology, proceeded to set down "what oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed."'

Or what will the Jesuits say when they read Mr. Pogson Smith's account of themselves as they were in the days of Pope Pius v.? 'By his Bull of Deposition in 1570 Pope Pius v. had challenged the struggle, and rendered the position of English Catholics untenable. From a respected if prohibited faith they became recusants: from recusants, traitors. It was the Papal policy and its indefatigable agents the Jesuits which were to blame. What peace was possible with men who repudiated moral obligations, who hesitated at no crime *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*? The same dishonesty which covered their actions and their name with infamy for succeeding generations, rendered their apologetic literature the poorest trash and the most immoral stuff that was ever justly consigned to oblivion. Bellarmine and Baronius once were names to conjure with: does any one respect them now? Their only merit is that they called for answer—and some of the answers are among the most precious treasures of English Theology. Hobbes too must break a lance with Bellarmine in the *Leviathan*. And Hobbes was not the least vigorous or the worst equipped of the English champions.'

The stream of literature on Religion steadily increases in volume. And with its increase comes ever enlarging interest in it. Its study at the Universities receives increasing encouragement; its value to the preacher obtains increasing recognition. This winter some ethnic religion, or the comparative study of some widespread religious custom, will be a favourite subject of study at young men's meetings.

Mr. L. H. Jordan, the author of *Comparative Religion, its Genesis and Growth*, has this month published a volume on *The Study of Religion in the Italian Universities* (Clarendon Press; 6s. net). The body of the book is a translation of a smaller book by Professor Labanca of Rome on this subject. Round Professor Labanca's brochure Mr. Jordan has gathered a great many facts, mostly personal and literary, bearing upon the subject, and at the end of the volume he has furnished the best popular account we have yet seen of the history of the Modernist Movement in Italy. The chapter on the Modernist Movement he has also published separately at the Clarendon Press (2s. net).

Only the greatest men have the privilege of reading their own biography. It is a privilege that they cannot always appreciate. Dr. J. B. Paton of Nottingham is a great man, and he will read his own biography, as it has been written by Mr. James Marchant, without a pang. For it is written not by an admirer only but by a lover, who openly avows his love and is not in the least ashamed of it. It is only a lover who could have written the biography of Dr. Paton. For the biography could not have been written by one who did not know him, and every one who knows him loves him. The title of the book is, *J. B. Paton, M.A., D.D., Educational and Social Pioneer* (Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d. net).

Under the title of *Life in His Name* (Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. D. M. M'Intyre of Glasgow has given an account of the way of salvation as he understands it. He understands it very well. He has had experience. And he is careful not to make his own experience a leaden mould into which other men's experience is compelled to run. But with all variety of experience the way of salvation is one, and Mr. M'Intyre describes it.

Those are two of the most attractive of the books which Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have published this month. But there are others.

There is *The Christian of To-day*, by Robert Veitch, M.A. (3s. 6d. net), a book which should be read before Mr. M'Intyre's. It begins with a study of Religion, exhibiting the pre-eminence of

the Christian religion among the religions, before it comes to the things which Mr. M'Intyre handles. And when it comes to them it deals with them for the sake of the unbeliever, as he deals with them for the believer's sake. Mr. Veitch is as earnest as Mr. M'Intyre in his ambassage for Christ, but he is sent as an ambassador to those that are without.

There is, further, a new volume of essays by Mr. J. Brierley, B.A. Its title is *Aspects of the Spiritual* (3s. 6d. net). It is a good title, as we should expect it to be. It illustrates one of Mr. Brierley's gifts. The note of the book is progress. Mr. Brierley does not think that we are done with heresies or heresy hunts, but he is quite sure that the only heresy worth hunting now is that which shuts up Divine revelation to a distant past, that which excludes the present and the future from any share in it.

Next, there are two smaller books, but they are not inferior. One with the misleading title of *The Church and the Next Generation* (2s. net), and written by the Rev. Richard Roberts of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, London, is a contribution to the Sunday School question. The literature of the Sunday School is illimitable, but this book makes much of it unnecessary. It is both theoretical and practical. It gives workable principles for fulfilling the great end of the Sunday School, and it shows how these principles can be made to work.

The other is a study in the *Problems of Immanence*, by Dr. Warschauer (2s. 6d. net). It is an answer to 'the lazy Monism that idly haunts the regions of God's name.' The words are the words of Professor William James. Dr. Warschauer adopts them. But Dr. Warschauer is no mere echo of Professor James. He has thought for himself as deeply as any professional philosopher on the great problems that gather round the little words 'God' and 'man.' He has his message, and he can make his generation listen to it.

It will be enough to name the two volumes which remain. The one is a collection of papers from various periodicals by the Rev. J. M. Whiton, Ph.D. Its title is *Interludes in a Time of Change, Ethical, Social, Theological* (3s. 6d. net). And one is a volume of addresses to young women on the making of character. The author is the Rev. Thomas Yates, and the title *Sculptors of Life* (2s. 6d. net).

That it is quite possible, though it may be against all our anticipations, to combine the most thoroughgoing acceptance of the results of the criticism of the Old Testament with the most confident belief in the Old Testament as a revelation of the will of God, is shown once more in a volume of *Studies in the Old Testament*, by George Jackson, B.A. (Culley; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Jackson has a message for young men. In an almost phenomenally successful ministry in this country he drew young men to him in numbers, instructed them, rescued them, and steadied them. The lectures which form this book were delivered at an American University. They enable us to understand the secret of Mr. Jackson's influence, an influence which he carries with him wherever he goes.

Whatever it was that determined the canon, whatever it was that decided whether a particular book should be included in it or not, it is probable that the question of Ethics came very little into the decision. For religion was the paramount interest when the canon was under formation; the study of Ethics had not arrived yet. But now the study of Ethics has come upon us in a great flood, and it is no surprise to find that when the Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., desired the degree of Doctor of Divinity, the thesis which he submitted to the University of London was on *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Culley; 5s. net).

He deserved the degree, and he got it. He will now receive the thanks of all students of the Apocrypha for the publication of his thesis. For he has shown that a thesis can combine thoroughness of research with popularity. How clearly he brings out the intimate connexion between Ethics and Religion. To the Apocryphal writers the immoral man is simply the idolater, and, just as in the O.T. itself, the terrible word whoredom for apostasy is here much more than a mere metaphor.

Mr. Culley of the Wesleyan Book Room has this month published also a volume of Sunday Afternoon Addresses to men, by the Rev. G. Gilbert Muir, entitled *Shoulder to Shoulder* (2s. 6d.); a popular biography of *Joan of Arc*, by Arthur Whetnall (2s. 6d.); an anthology of prose and verse on the Lord's Prayer, by the Rev. T. Alexander Seed, entitled *The Universal Prayer*

(1s. 6d. net); and a biography of *The Rev. W. B. Pope, D.D.*, by Professor R. W. Moss of Didsbury (1s. net).

A man who has written a *History of the Christian Church* for students that has reached the fifth edition may confidently say of himself that he has shaped the theological thinking of his time. That man is Canon Foakes Jackson of Cambridge. The new edition contains an additional chapter on 'Christianity beyond the Limits of the Roman Empire,' and three maps. The book is again thoroughly abreast of the scholarship of the day; and if Canon Foakes Jackson keeps it so, we have no doubt whatever that its circulation in the future will be even more rapid than in the past. For on every hand there is evidence that the student of the Church is tired of the Church history that is only the apologetic of a party. Canon Foakes Jackson is not an apologist, but a historian. The publishers are Messrs. J. Hall & Son of Cambridge (8s. net).

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published the seventh volume of the seventh series of the *Expositor* (7s. 6d. net). They never published a better volume. With all sincerity and thankfulness one can say of the *Expositor*, 'Age cannot wither it, nor custom stale its infinite variety.' How great a testimony it is to the infinite variety and everlasting interest of the great Book itself! Out of the contents of this volume one might select for re-reading Professor H. R. Mackintosh's article on 'The Unio-Mystica as a Theological Conception,' or, say, Professor H. A. A. Kennedy's article on 'Apostolic Preaching and Emperor Worship.' But notice also that this volume contains the first chapter of Sir W. M. Ramsay's 'Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy.'

Are Revivals of the past? Is their day over and gone? If not, how is it that we have had their psychology written, and that we now have their history? Their psychology has been written by Professor William James and others. Their history has just been written by the Rev. James Burns, M.A.

Mr. Burns does not believe that the revival is a thing of the past. In front of his history of Revivals he has written an account of the Laws of Revival, of the Theology of Revivals, and of the Coming Revival. The title of his book is *Revivals: Their Laws and Leaders* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

There is a Lectureship known as the Alexander Robertson endowment. It is attached to the University of Glasgow. The first Lecturer (we think he is the first) was the Rev. Andrew Miller, who took as his subject *The Problem of Theology in Modern Life and Thought* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

The volume is a contribution to the Apologetics of Christianity. But not of the old systematic all-embracing style of apologetic. The Christian Religion, says Mr. Miller, is a spiritual experience, and he gives himself to the exposition of that experience. It is his own experience, as it ought to be, and that gives it life, and here and there even intensity of interest. But it is his own experience controlled and enriched by the experience of the Church. If one is in search of a creed capable of commending itself to a man's conscience in the sight of God, expressed in modern language and with undeniable conviction, he will find it in this strong book.

Professor E. O. Davies, B.Sc., of Bala, has written *Prolegomena to Systematic Theology* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). The book consists of notes of lectures to students of the Theological College in Bala. And the notes have to be extended, either by the students themselves, or by any other teacher of Theology who chooses to use them. But what a revolution in the study of Theology they indicate. Here are twenty chapters, each containing material for at least one complete lecture, and they have all to be mastered before the study of Systematic Theology is begun. One chapter deals with the origin of Religion, another with its philosophy; one with the place of Archæology, another with the infallibility of the Pope.

Professor A. T. Robertson of Louisville, Kentucky, has written a companion volume to his *Epochs in the Life of Jesus*, and called it *Epochs in the Life of St. Paul*. He has been encouraged to write the new book by the generous reception accorded to the old; and that same generous reception has led him to follow the lines of

popular exposition which he had laid down in it. Professor Robertson has no desire to spend his life in the blazing of trails. Where the roads are laid down already he follows, and builds homesteads. He knows the tracks. His list of literature here is well chosen, full and accurate. Whether he has read all the books he mentions in it, we cannot tell, but he has certainly read some that he does not mention. His volume will be used as a text-book. (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

To his 'Historical Bible,' Professor Charles Foster Kent of Yale has added the volume on *The Kings and Prophets of Israel and Judah* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). We hope it is understood that Professor Kent's Historical Bible is a step in advance of every effort that has yet been made to offer the Old Testament for study according to the results of modern criticism. It *is* a book for study. And therefore Professor Kent pays much attention to literature. In an appendix to this volume he gathers together 'a practical reference library.' First of all he speaks of books for constant reference. This is what he says about them:

'The literature which comes from the period of the Divided Kingdom is so voluminous, the critical and historical problems so many, and the extra-biblical, contemporary records are so rich, that certain supplemental reference books are almost indispensable. The second volume of the "Student's Old Testament," entitled *Israel's Historical and Biographical Narrative*, contains the biblical, historical records of the period, arranged in their logical order with detailed introductions to the individual books. The third volume, entitled *Prophetic Addresses, Epistles and Apocalypses*, contains the contemporary prophecies arranged in chronological order, with detailed introductions and a full treatment of the entire subject of Hebrew prophecy. The fourth volume, *Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents*, contains the corresponding laws classified according to their subject-matter and within each group arranged according to their respective dates. A good, modern Bible dictionary, such as Hastings' one-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, or better, the larger five-volume edition, should be at the command of every teacher and student. The geographical background of the stirring events of this period is vividly presented in Professor George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. Assyria touched and influenced Israel's history so fundamentally during these two or three centuries, that it is important to refer frequently to a standard history of the Assyrians and Babylonians, such as that of Professor Goodspeed.'

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published another book by Principal Forsyth. Its title is *The Cruciality of the Cross* (5s.). It is a title that, like man himself, is fearfully and wonderfully made. It recalls the title of Dr. Campbell Morgan's *The Crises of the Christ*. But an ugly title is often as good for a book as a bad review; it keeps it from being forgotten.

There is no fear, however, that Dr. Forsyth's book will be forgotten. There is far too much vitality in it for an early death, far too much originality for early oblivion. It contains just the kind of work which Dr. Forsyth does best. It contains four papers, each of them prepared for a special occasion and written off at white heat. But the book is more than the four separate papers, for each of the four papers deals with one and the same subject, and the one strengthens and illustrates the other. The subject is Atonement through the Death of Christ.

One of the best known volumes of Messrs. Macmillan's well-known theological manuals, with their dark purple cloth, has been Maclear's *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*. The first edition was published in 1895. The preface to the second edition, published in 1896, was still signed by Canon Maclear, but the revision was mainly the work of the Rev. Watkin W. Williams, M.A. The third edition is altogether Mr. Williams' work. It has just been published (10s. 6d.). Besides the revision, which is much more thorough than in the second edition, there is an appendix of notes on the Eclecticism of Elizabeth, the Personality of God, the Circumincession, and other theological and ecclesiastical topics.

There is a place yet for a new commentary. It must be both exposition and exhortation. The exposition must of course be accurate, and the exhortation honest. That is to say, there is a place and a hearty welcome for a whole series of commentaries like the commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians which the Rev. J. H. Jowett

has written and named *The High Calling* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Methuen have published the third and fourth volumes of their 'Handbooks of English Church History,' edited by the Rev. John Henry Burn, B.D. One is the volume on *The Mediæval Church and the Papacy*, by Arthur C. Jennings, M.A.; the other is *The Reformation Period*, by Henry Gee, D.D. (2s. 6d. net each). What do these names signify? Mr. Jennings' name has hitherto been associated with the study of the Old Testament. It signifies nothing as yet in Church History. But Dr. Gee's name means that the series is to be kept free from extravagance of every kind, that such words as High Church or Low Church are not once to be thought of in connexion with it. And with that agrees the volume which Mr. Jennings has written.

How is it that in this country the advanced student of the Old Testament is the conservative student of the New? It is because he does not begin, as the Continental critic does, by denying the supernatural. He takes the evidence as he finds it. He finds that the conditions of the composition of the Old Testament do not hold good in the New. If he rejected the supernatural, he would of course be driven to a radical rearrangement of great portions of the New Testament and to a denial of anything like contemporary authorship. But since he accepts the supernatural, he can accept the Lucan authorship of the Acts and the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel; and, following the evidence as he finds it, he can believe that the fact of the Resurrection underlies the narratives of it.

The Rev. J. R. Cohu is an advanced critic of the Old Testament and a conservative critic of the New. Some years ago he wrote a thoroughly radical book on *The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Research*. He has now written a thoroughly conservative book on *The Gospels in the Light of Modern Research* (Parker; 6s. net). He believes both in the Lucan authorship of the Acts and in the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

An extremely valuable addition has been made to the literature of Lutheranism, and at the same time to the literature of Creeds and Confessions, by the publication of the late Professor Richard's *Confessional History of the Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society; $3).

It is a popular work. That is to say, it is written for reading, and not merely for referring to. But that does not prevent it from being of scientific value. Professor Richard was occupied with it for the last twenty years of his life, and it is evident that he did not spare himself. The whole subject is described from its very beginnings in the order of development and dependence; the authorities are unerringly chosen; the proportion is well maintained; and the author has been strong enough to acknowledge himself beaten occasionally through lack of evidence, while he gives his judgment unreservedly whenever the evidence is sufficient. From what one of his colleagues says, we see that the death of Dr. Richard has been a serious loss to the Gettysburg Theological Seminary. The possession of this book should do something to make up for it.

In *The Life of the World to Come* (Pilgrim Press; 3s. 6d. net), the Vicar of St. Mary's, Westminster, has deliberately abstained from the drawing of distinctions and the fixing of limits, like Dante's Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven. For he recognizes that these divisions and distinctions are an accommodation to human language, an appeal to the imagination rather than a statement of scientific fact. His book is written for the purpose of delivering us from the fear of death, and he seeks to be as practical, and even prosaic, as possible. He believes in the value of prayer on our behalf, not only whilst we are in this life, but also after we have passed to the life that is to come; and he would rejoice to see prayers for the dead recognized in the national worship of the land. In his caution he is very courageous, saying even of spirit rapping that its 'testimony cannot be set lightly aside, and it would be hazardous to deny that this mysterious region will yet add fresh chapters to our knowledge.'

Encyclopædias are usually arranged in alphabetical order. Not so *The Girl's Encyclopædia* (Pilgrim Press; 3s. 6d. net). And it has not even an index. But all the things that most intimately affect the happiness of girls will be found discussed somewhere in its pages, from the nursing of a tooth to the courting of a lover. If the book is to

be read right through, as it ought to be, the arrangement in chapters is better, perhaps, than an alphabetical arrangement would have been. The author is Miss Amy B. Barnard, L.L.A.

After long waiting, an editor has been found for Isaac Taylor's *Words and Places*, an editor thoroughly competent and sufficiently enthusiastic. It is the Rev. A. Smythe Palmer, D.D. The new edition (Routledge; 6s.) is a new book. Dr. Smythe Palmer could have written from the foundation. But this is a vast subject, and for once it is better that one learned man should edit another man's work. Even since Isaac Taylor wrote there have appeared so many works on the etymology of proper names that it must have taken the most of a man's lifetime to master them and incorporate their results. Dr. Smythe Palmer might have claimed the glory of a great comprehensive work of his own on the subject. He has been content to edit Isaac Taylor, and he has done it thoroughly.

To the old puzzle why God had respect to Abel's offering and not to Cain's, there is an answer in a new volume of sermons, entitled *The Writing on the Sky* (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d.). The volume, of which the author is the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham, M.A., has more than one surprise of exposition in it, though the sermons have not been prepared as surprises. They have too much to do with the duty of the day for that. Mr. Fotheringham says that 'there is something a little more precious in Abel's offering than in Cain's. The fruit will grow again, and the ground will yield its increase once more in the coming year: but a life that has been taken—ah, that is an irreparable deed. Something has been *given* to the Lord, and it can never be the giver's again. Cain's is the loan on deposit: Abel's is the real sacrifice: and thus it is to Abel's offering that the Lord has respect, and not unto Cain's.'

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have published the ninth volume of the new series of the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* (10s. 6d. net). It contains the papers read before the Society during the thirtieth session, 1908–9. What are the papers? They are (1) Mental Activity in Willing and in Ideas, by Professor S. Alexander; (2) Bergson's Theory of Knowledge, by Mr. H. Wildon Carr; (3) The Place of Experts in Democracy, a Symposium, by Professor B. Bosanquet, Mrs. Sophie Bryant, and Professor G. R. T. Ross; (4) The Rationalistic Conception of Truth, by Dr. F. C. S. Schiller; (5) The Mutual Symbolism of Intelligence and Activity, by Dr. Hubert Foston; (6) The Satisfaction of Thinking, by Professor G. R. T. Ross; (7) Natural Realism and Present Tendencies in Philosophy, by Dr. A. Wolf; (8) Why Pluralism? a Symposium, by Professor J. H. Muirhead, Dr. F. C. S. Schiller, and Professor A. E. Taylor; (9) Are Presentations Mental or Physical? a reply to Professor S. Alexander, by Professor Stout.

What was the Scene of Abraham's Sacrifice?

By A. H. Sayce, Litt.D., LL.D., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

In the time of the Chronicler (2 Ch 3^1) the temple-hill at Jerusalem was known as Mount Moriah, and it was believed to have been the scene of Abraham's sacrifice. According to Gn 22^2, this took place on 'one of the mountains' in 'the land of Moriah,' where instead of 'Moriah,' or rather 'the Moriah' (*Ham-morîyyâh*), the Septuagint reads ὑψηλὴν, 'high(-lands).' Like Moreh (Gn 12^6), which is a transliteration of the cuneiform Martu—the Brathy, probably, of Sanchuniathon—Hammorîyyâh would correspond with the cuneiform Amurru, 'Amorite'; the variant reading points in this direction, and the termination would have been Hebraized as in Aranyah (2 S 24^{18}), for Araunah. Indeed, the Septuagint presupposes a reading Ham-mârôm, an accurate reproduction so far as the Kethibh is concerned of the Babylonian Amurrum.

That the temple-mount was really meant by the writer of Genesis is, however, pretty clear.

Abraham was ordered to go from Beer-sheba to the highlands, and on the third day after starting saw 'the place afar off.'[1] This would exactly agree with the distance between Beer-sheba and Jerusalem at the ordinary rate of travelling in the south of Palestine. To make the matter clearer, the writer quotes a saying current in his own time: 'In the mount of the Lord יראה.'

The present punctuation, and consequently translation, of the last word goes back at least to the age of the Septuagint, which renders the passage, 'In the mount the Lord was seen.' The identification of it, moreover, with *yîr'âh*, 'reverence,' is excluded by the name 'Jehovah-jireh,' to which the saying is attached. Hence a translation: 'In the mount of the Lord is reverence,' must be put aside. On the other hand, *yêrâeh*, 'he is seen,' requires a nominative, as the Septuagint translators perceived, while Jehovah-jireh, 'Jehovah sees,' is an impossible name for a place. A substantive is required after the divine name, as in other similar compounds (Jehovah-nissi, Jehovah-shalom, Jehovah-tsidkenu, Jehovah-shammah).

The difficulties vanish, however, as soon as we turn the passage into Assyrian. The cuneiform original of the proverb would be: *ina sad Yau urtu*, 'in the mount of Yahveh is the revelation,' and the name of the place would be *Yau-sa-urti*, 'Yahveh of the revelation,' or, more probably, *urrat Yau*, 'the revelation of Yahveh.'

The cases in which the Babylonian order of words is transposed in the Hebrew transcription are numerous, as may be seen from my archæological commentary on the Book of Genesis: *Yahveh Elohim* for *ilâni Yau* is an example. Similar instances of transposition are found in Assyrian translations from Sumerian as well as in the Hittite tablets of Boghaz Keui.

Har-el, 'the mount of God,' is one of the places captured by Thothmes III. in the south of Palestine (No. 81), and the name is transferred by Ezekiel (43^{15}) to the altar of the new Jerusalem. In Isaiah ($29^{1.2}$) the word is written Ari-el, with a play upon a Moabite word of similar sound which signified 'hero' (see Moabite Stone, ll. 12, 17, and Is 33^{7}). *Ari* as well as *ar*—a word borrowed from Sumerian—is given in a cuneiform tablet as the (West Semitic) equivalent of 'highlands.'

Ezekiel's altar corresponds with the Du-azagga or 'Holy Hill' of the temple of Bel-Merodach at Babylon, where the god revealed himself at the feast of the New Year and delivered his oracles. It was a model of the Du-azagga in the temple of Ea at Eridu, which was itself believed to be a representation of 'the deep,' wherein Ea had his throne. Bel-Merodach, as the son of Ea, inherited not only his father's wisdom, but also 'the Holy Hill' (called *Tilu ellu* in Semitic) whereon his revelations were made. It stood in the inner sanctuary of the temple, and there the *urtu* or 'oracle' was received by the priest.

Bel-Merodach of Babylon had dethroned the older Bel of Babylonia, Ellil of Nippur. Ellil was addressed as Sadu rabu, 'the great mountain,' and his temple at Nippur was called E-Kur, 'the House of the Mountain,' of which it was regarded as a copy. His wife was Nin-Kharsag, 'the Mistress of the Mountain.' As the Sumerian *nin* was genderless, it often became the male 'Master' in Semitic Babylonian theology, and Delitzsch therefore may be right in connecting Sadu with the El-Shaddai of Genesis, Shaddai being the dual Sadâ, though it would seem more probable to make it an adjectival derivative from *sadu* in the sense of 'mountaineer.' However this may be, the El Elyon, or 'Most High God,' of Gn 14^{18} is the equivalent of the Babylonian Sadu rabu, reminding us that the Syrians declared the gods of the Israelites to be 'gods of the hills' (1 K 20^{23}). Further north, on Mount Shêkh Baragât, near Aleppo, the God of the Mountain was worshipped under the name of Salamanês, the Shalman of the Assyrians, who, however, was called 'the fish' on the banks of the Khabur and Euphrates, where he was identified, not with Ellil, but with 'Ea, king of the gods.'

The messenger or 'angel' of Ellil was Nin-ip, one of whose titles was Nabu, 'the prophet,' and we can therefore now understand why in one of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets the king of Jersusalem should refer to 'the city of the mountain of Jerusalem, whose name is Bit-Nin-ip, the city of the (Egyptian) king.' Winchester translates, 'a city of the land of Jerusalem,' but this would require *estin alu* in the Assyrian text. At one time I supposed that Bit-Nin-ip was Jerusalem itself, but the context shows that this could not have been the case, and that Bit-Nin-ip was not Jerusalem but a town very close to it. Just as Nebo, the angel of Merodach, was worshipped at

[1] The phrase used is Assyrian; cf. *Gilgames-Epic*, x. 24.

Borsippa which adjoined Babylon, so Nin-ip would have been worshipped in a city which adjoined the seat of the cult of Ellil.

In Gn 22^{11} 'the angel of Yahveh' takes the place of the Elohim of the previous verses. The following verse, however, shows that 'Elohim' must have originally stood here also. Translating this into the terms of Babylonian theology, we should say that Nin-ip has been substituted for Ellil.

That the sanctity of the Sakhra rock at Jerusalem goes back to neolithic times has been pointed out by Mr. Clarkson Wallis (*P.E.F. Quarterly Statement*, 1905, p. 164), who was the first to notice its resemblance to the neolithic sanctuary-cave at Gezer. That it should have continued to be a sacred place in the bronze age would be in accordance with the immemorial custom of the East. When David captured first the fortress of the Jebusites on Zion, and then Jerusalem itself, the dwelling-place of the Jebusites, there must have still been a temple there; hence the proverb, 'The blind and the lame shall not enter the temple' (2 S 5^{8}). As in Egypt, so in Western Asia, it must be remembered that the temple was also a fortress, and the capture of the outpost on Zion would have been merely the prelude to the capture of the city itself. After the capture of the city, though the Jebusites were left in possession of the temple-hill, it would seem that the sanctuary was destroyed; otherwise it is difficult to understand how Araunah could have had his threshing-floor on the spot.

To sum up. We may conclude that the temple-hill was already a sacred spot in the neolithic age. When Uru-Salim, 'the city of Salim,' was founded by the Babylonians in 'the land of the Amorites,' its sanctity was still respected, and it became a seat of the worship of Ellil, the Sadu rabu or 'great mountain,' whom the Amorites called Ḗlyon, 'the Most High.' Here, therefore, rose a high-place, formed of monoliths like that discovered by Mr. Macalister at Gezer, and here in its sacred grove Abraham found the ram (*élim* in Sumerian) which was the symbol of Ellil (S^{c} 312),—not, be it noticed, the lamb of vv.^{7,8}, which was not consecrated to the Babylonian god. Before the age of David, the monoliths had made way for a 'temple,' perhaps under Hittite influence. In the reign of Solomon the old 'mountain of God' became a 'mountain of Yahveh,' and the ancient proverb, 'In the mountain of God is the revelation,' or 'oracle,' received a new application, aided by the substitution of the Phœnician alphabet and the Canaanitish language for the Babylonian script and language, which had hitherto been in use.

The history of the temple-hill thus offers a curious parallel to that of a rock-shrine I once discovered near Dirr in Nubia. This was originally dedicated to the *Ka* of an Egyptian of the eighteenth dynasty, to whom offerings were accordingly made. With the introduction of Christianity the Egyptian became Isu, or Jesus, to whom the old offerings continued to be presented, and after the triumph of Mohammedanism Isu passed into the Moslem Shêkh Isu. The offerings and cult, however, remained unchanged, and to this day the cup of water, or beer, and the bowl filled with corn are duly laid on the ancient altar for the Mohammedan saint.

Contributions and Comments.

The Name Abraham in Babylonian.

In the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1894, p. 212, Professor Hommel announced that he had discovered the proper name *A-bi-e-ra-mu* on a contract published by Professor Meissner in his indispensable book *Beiträge zum Altbabylonischen Privatrecht*, No. 111. The original is in the Royal Museum of Berlin, catalogued VAT 1473, and has the contract in duplicate, that is, the contract on the tablet is copied on to the outer case, and both copies are intact. Hommel repeated his discovery in several books, and it misled Professor Sayce in his *Early History of the Hebrews*, and Dr. Pinches in his *Old Testament in the Light of Assyrian and Babylonian Research*, but the latter has corrected the matter in his third edition, 1908. As a matter of fact the name does not stand on the tablet, but both inner and outer copies have *A-bi-e-ra-aḫ*, as

Dr. Ranke correctly read in his *Personal Names of the Hammurabi Dynasty*, p. 58. The text has been republished in the official publications of the Berlin Museum, *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler*, vol. viii. No. 12. The word in question occurs at line 18 on the tablet, and 19 on the case. Professor Driver also corrects this error in the seventh edition of his Book of Genesis, p. xlix.

The name, however, does occur several times on tablets in the Berlin Museum, published in vol. vii. of the same series, and Dr. Ungnad has recently called attention to this fact in his edition of some letters from Dilbat, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. vi. part 1. The tablets are from Dilbat, dated in the reign of *'Ammizaduga*, fourth successor of *'Ammurabi*, contemporary of the Biblical Abraham. I give here a translation of one of the most interesting of the transactions in which the Babylonian Abraham was concerned.

'One work ox of Ibni-Sin, son of Sin-imgurani, from Ibni-Sin, through the agency of Qišti-Nabium, son of *Etirum*, *Abarama*, son of Abil-Aštar,[1] has rented for one month. For one month he shall pay a shekel of silver. Thereof Qišti-Nabium has received a half-shekel of silver from the hand of *Abarama*. In the presence of Idin-Uraš, son of Idin-Lagamal, Abilija, son of Šamaš-rimanni, Bêlijatum the scribe. Month of Elul, twentieth day, eleventh year of 'Ammizaduga.'[2]

The tablet has the seal impression of Idin-Uraš, son of Idin-Lagamal, worshipper of the god Ramman. Qišti-Nabium pressed his thumb-nail upon the tablet three times.

Number 97 is a receipt for one shekel of silver from *Abam-rama*, who had rented a field for the 13th year of 'Ammizaduga. The creditors are Sin-idinnam and Iddatum.

Number 101 contains a record by Abraham's brother, who rents a field from the same Sin-idinnam. The contract being characteristic of many others, I give it here:—'Four *GAN*[3] of arable land in the estate Bâb-alla (?), beside the field of *Abam-rama*, and beside four *GAN* of the field of Šuzut-ubarrum;—the field of Sin-idinnam, son of Eriba-Ninib, from Sin-idinnam, owner of the field, Iddatum, son of Abil-Aštar, has taken over for cultivation for a full (?) year; the income of a year rated at eight *GUR* of grain to 18 *GAN*.[4] At harvest time he will measure out grain at the ratio 8 *GUR* to 18 *GAN*. Of the income for the field for a full (?) year he has received a half-shekel of silver. In the presence of Ibni-Emahtila,[5] chief governor of Enu^{ki}, Arad-Tašmetum, son of E-abbā, Ili-awelim, son of Abu the psalmist. Month Shebet, second day of the 14th year of 'Ammizaduga.'[6]

Number 102 contains a lease of land from the same Sin-Idinnam to Girra-nada, a governor in the land of the Amorites;[7] the field lay adjacent to *Abam-rama*. Among the witnesses is Milki-Ramman, evidently a West Semitic name, either Arabic or Canaanitish; cf. מַלְכִּי צֶדֶק, Melchisedek.

Number 198 is a letter concerning the same plot of ground rented from Sin-idinnam in No. 101. 'To the freeman[8] say, thus [saith] Gimil-Mardukku; May Šamaš and Marduk keep thee in life. Mayest thou prosper, mayest thou live. May thy divine protector sustain thy head unto good fortune. I have written for thy welfare. May thy welfare be for ever before Šamaš and Marduk.

'Concerning the four *GAN* of land of Sin-idinnam which thou wrotest me to lease for

[1] I have transcribed *aš-tar*, since the name is written with a sign compounded of *aš+tar*. The writing evidently attempts to reproduce the South Arabian Athtar, god of the morning star, Venus, and proves that we are dealing here with a community who had carried into Babylonia the ancient Sabean god, who became Ashtoreth in Canaanitish, and Ishtar in native Babylonian. Both Canaanite and Babylonian made a female out of this ancient Semitic god, probably through Sumerian influence. In Sumerian Nana, with whom Athtar was identified, is a goddess.

[2] *V.S.* vii. 92.

[3] A *GAN* is about $\frac{2}{3}$ of an acre.

[4] This would make the rental about 2¼ bushels to the acre.

[5] The name means 'The temple Emahtila has created him'; this temple was the chief chapel of the god Nebo at Barsippa. The witness himself is probably an inhabitant of Dilbat. Hommel, *Geographie*, p. 397, has called attention to the fact that Dilbat and Barsippa must have been near each other. It probably lay a short distance south of Babylon, west of the Euphrates. Hommel's suggestion for placing Dilbat in this locality is strongly supported by the fact that the Babylonians named their *south-west* gate after the chief god of Dilbat, *i.e.*, the *Anu Gate* (see *Expositor*, July 1909, p. 83, and 95 note 1).

[6] The year is really dated by a Sumerian formula, 'Year in which 'Ammizaduga the king magnified the shrine Dumahhu grandly, shrine where sits the king, upon which is a mountain with many rivers [and brought it into the temple].' This translation is based upon a corrected text.

[7] Or an officer of the property of the temple belonging to the Amorite god in Dilbat. The meaning of the term *'akil Amurrī* is uncertain.

[8] A title like our Sir.

Abam-rama, the chief governor and the son of E-abbātu[1] having stood as witnesses, in the presence of Sin-idinnam it was rented.[2] Four *GAN* of land I leased for *Abam-ra-am*, as thou didst write. To write to thee I have not delayed (?).'[3]

These texts leave no possible doubt as to the fact that the name Abrām was current in the days of Hammurabi. The Hebrew tradition evidently preserved two pronunciations, one *Abam-ra-'-am*, and one *Abam-ra-am*. The former would be the original Babylonian uncontracted form, with hiatus to represent an elided guttural. It is this form which lies at the basis of Hebrew אַבְרָהָם, where the ה represents the Babylonian breathing. Naturally אַבְרָם is nothing but the Babylonian contracted form. The Hebrews later took the two words for different roots, but their philological explanation in Gn 17[5] had better be passed over in silence. It is one of those philological monstrosities in which both Babylonian and Hebrew too often indulged. The word is apparently South Arabian, from a root ראם, 'to love.' The later Arabic pronounced the perfect *ra'ima*, 'he loved,' the imperfect *ia'ramu*. The forms *râma*, *ra-am* = *râm* appear to be the infinitive or imperative. At any rate the usual Hebrew derivation from רום, 'to be exalted,' is excluded by the fact that the Babylonian has *abū* in the accusative. The name means apparently, 'love the father.'

I might also add that the name *Joseph-el* is also a pure fantasy still current in some quarters. The name should read *Jašub-ilu*, 'God dwells.' Hommel warned the general reader against this explanation in his *Altisrälitische Überlieferung*, p. 111. Moreover, the Sabean word יסף, in the Hebrew Jôseph, has been found (with ם), so that the form with שׁ would be altogether impossible. The case is not much better with Jacob, supposed to exist in *Ja-ku-up-ilu*, *Jakupi*, *Akupu*,[4] which have *kaph* not *koph*. The early texts usually distinguish these letters; cf. אלכוף in Sabean. Of course יַעֲקֹב and יוסף may be found in unpublished texts.

STEPHEN LANGDON.

Oxford.

[1] The same two persons as witnesses in 101.

[2] *Šu-zu-ma*, Semitic for legal phrase, *ib-ta-è*.

[3] *Ú-ta-zib* (!). Uncertain. Ungnad has also edited this letter, with a different interpretation. See Arthur Ungnad, *Altbabylonische Briefe aus Dilbat*, BA vi. pt. i. p. 59.

[4] *V.S.* viii. 14. 14.

2 Corinthians iii. 17.

ONE of the most striking alterations made by the Revisers is to be found in the rendering adopted by them in this verse: 'Now the Lord is the Spirit,' *i.e.* Christ is identical with the Holy Spirit. It is not disputed that *per se* this rendering is perfectly allowable, but it is a serious objection that it makes St. Paul contradict the teaching of the other writers of the New Testament — St. Matthew,[5] St. Peter, and St. John. It has been urged in reply that, while the Apostles, who had seen our Lord during His lifetime, knew that He was a separate Person from the Holy Spirit, St. Paul, who had only seen the glorified and spiritual Christ, might not have realized the distinction. But this explanation overlooks the fact that the Three Persons of the Trinity are mentioned separately by St. Paul himself in 2 Co 13[13]—that is, either in this very Epistle, or in one written only a few months previously. Baljon, indeed, finds it so surprising that St. Paul could identify Son and Spirit, that he hazards a conjectural emendation οὗ δὲ ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν.

It is a further objection to the rendering of the R.V. that it makes an abrupt break, or rather two breaks, in the Apostle's argument. In v.[16] he is speaking of Israel's conversion to Christ; but in v.[17] he would turn aside to tell us that our Lord is the Holy Spirit; and finally in v.[18], instead of developing this idea, he returns to his former subject.

In any case the rendering of the R.V. is only one out of three possible translations. If the Revisers disagreed with the A.V., it was open to them to adopt the rendering of Wycliffe: 'The Spirit is the Lord,' *i.e.* is God. This translation has the unanimous support of the Greek Fathers, formed the basis of the corresponding clause in the Nicene Creed, and is even made by Pearson a test of orthodoxy. Any rendering with this amount of authority is entitled to the most respectful consideration. Still, though greatly superior to the R.V., this explanation of the clause is not without difficulties of its own.

In the first place, the order of words in vv.[17. 18] is against it. Hort, who accepted it, met the difficulty by regarding κυρίου as an

[5] That is if we possess 28[20] in its original form.

adjective in both verses, and by changing κυρίου in v.[17] to κύριον. Michelsen reaches the same result by changing it to κυριεύει. But these emendations only serve to emphasize the difficulty.

Secondly, we should expect κύριος in v.[17] to have the same meaning as in v.[16],[1] and there is scarcely any room for doubt that τὸν κύριον in v.[16] refers to Christ.

Thirdly, there is nothing in the context to suggest the assertion of the Divinity of the Spirit. It was natural for the Greek Fathers, in their struggle with Macedonianism, to discover such allusions. But the Person, whose rejection by the Jews St. Paul is here thinking of, is the Son.

Still, when all this has been allowed for, the change made by Tyndale ('The Lord no doubt is a spirit') was as little an improvement as that accepted by the Revisers.

But the rendering in the Bishops' Bible, followed by the A.V. ('Now the Lord is that spirit,'[2] *i.e.* the spirit mentioned in v.[6]), is free from ambiguity and completely in accordance with the argument of the section.

In v.[6] St. Paul states that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. This idea of the letter leads him (*more suo*) for a time away from his subject. In v.[16] he brings this digression to a close with the thought of the conversion of Israel to Christ, and resumes the argument of v.[6]: Now (δὲ resumptive) the Lord is the spirit spoken of, and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. St. Paul might of course have said, 'Now the spirit is the spirit of the Lord, and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,'[3] but his actual phrase is clearer and less ambiguous. In the verse following he carries his argument a step further and brings it to a triumphant conclusion. We not only receive liberty, but we are transformed by the Lord, who is spirit,[4] into His own image.

H. H. B. Ayles.

[1] Chrysostom and Theophylact avoid this difficulty by referring τὸν κύριον in v.[16] to the Holy Spirit.

[2] Originally printed without a capital letter.

[3] Schmiedel rightly remarks on the way in which v.[17] carries on the idea of the preceding verse: Those who turn to Christ gain for themselves liberty.

[4] And therefore the author not of death, but of life. It will be noticed that the article before πνεῦμα, which was resumptive in v.[17], is omitted in v.[18].

Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?

בקדמין הוה מימרא
ומימרא הוה לות אלהא
ואלהא הוא מימרא׃

What was the original language of the Gospel according to St. John? There is, I think, some reason to reply, Aramaic. At any rate, this hypothesis throws new light on certain passages which appear to require it. To take an instance, in Jn 8[56] the present text makes Jesus say to the Jews, '*Your father Abraham exulted that he might see my day; and he saw, and was glad*'; the assertion being, apparently, that the patriarch looked forward with inspired prevision to the far-off time of the Saviour's birth. But the reply of the Jews is evidence that this was not what they understood by the words of Jesus, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old; *and hast thou seen Abraham?*' (v.[57]). Clearly the words which evoked this reply must have suggested to their minds an actual meeting between the patriarch and Jesus. Accordingly, we may suppose that the original text of the passage contained the affirmation, 'Your father Abraham was delighted *when* (or *because?*) *he saw my face;* yea, he saw and rejoiced.' An ill-written or injured Aramaic אפי ('my face') might easily have been confused with יומי ('my day'); or an editor who did not understand might have purposely changed the expression. The reference, of course, would be to Gn 18[1ff.], where Jahweh appears to Abraham, and is welcomed with glad hospitality. Jesus quite plainly identifies Himself with His Father, the God of Israel; and thus there is something to be said, after all, for the old-fashioned exegesis which saw a hint of the doctrine of the Trinity in the unique and beautiful narrative of Genesis. Let me reiterate my argument. The context of John 8[56] almost demands that our Lord's assertion about Abraham should be taken as referring to some incident of the Scriptural story, which was as familiar to His hearers as to Himself, but upon which He put a new and startling construction. The answer of the Jews indicates that it was not a reference to any supposed Messianic anticipations, but a reference to a personal interview—an actual meeting, face to face. To the Jews, of course, such a statement was entirely incredible; but our

Lord makes His meaning quite clear by the final affirmation, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Before Abraham was born, I AM*' (v.[58]). This our margin very properly compares with Ex 3[14].

We may perhaps recognize the same implication in Jn 5[46]. The Lord says to His Jewish adversaries, 'If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me: for he wrote of me.' It is evident from the context that He is not discussing the authorship of the Pentateuch. He is neither affirming nor denying the Mosaic origin of that wonderful compilation. Literary criticism of the O.T. is not the matter in hand. His concern is with His own claims; and He affirms that 'the Scriptures,' in general, 'testify' of Himself (v.[39]), and, above all, those Scriptures which the Jews especially 'trust' (v.[45]), namely, the Five Books of the Law. Now, in what sense could it be truly said that the Mosaic writings, as a whole, have Jesus Christ for their theme—for this is what His words seem to imply? Surely we may say, Only in the sense of that overwhelming claim which He makes everywhere in this Gospel; the claim of *being One with the Eternal Father*. People have been so busy with critical questions about the origin and composition of the Pentateuch, that they have missed what is possibly the most obvious implication of this remarkable passage. There is no mention of Jesus of Nazareth anywhere within the compass of the Five Books; and yet He does not hesitate to affirm, 'Moses wrote of me.' Yes! not only because of a few isolated and obscure verses which may be susceptible of a different interpretation; but because the main topic of those books is the self-revelation of Jahweh, the God of Israel, His Father. What Jahweh 'said' or 'spake' and what Jahweh did, from the creation of the world to the burial of Moses, is the actual theme of all the Books of the Law. ELOHIM, identified with JAHWEH, is the Protagonist of the Pentateuch.

'Moses,' therefore, wrote of Jesus because he wrote of the Father with whom the Lord was One (Jn 10[30]); and our passage is only another instance of the Lord's self-identification with the Deity. It asserts, in an unexpected way, the main doctrine of the Fourth Gospel (cf. v.[18], *making himself equal with God*).[1]

[1] It is not, of course, denied that passages like Jn 1[45] and Lk 24[27. 44] imply a reference to particular O.T. texts, regarded as prophecies relating to the Messiah. But, bearing in mind our Lord's surprisingly original exegesis of the old formula of Ex 3[6. 16] ('The God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'; see Mt 22[32] and ||), I cannot help regarding the above interpretation of Jn 5[46] as at once more consonant with the wider view of Christ and more consistent with the general thesis of the Fourth Gospel.

To return to the argument from language. Our assumption of a lost Aramaic text of St. John may be thought to find some degree of support in two remarkable utterances of the Baptist concerning Jesus. The first is that recorded in chap. i. 15: '*This was he whom I meant* (*when I said*), *He who is coming after me hath become before me, because he was before me.*' This testimony, virtually repeated in v.[27. 30], is most naturally understood as a reference to the fact that the Lord's influence was to displace, or was already displacing, that of His Forerunner (cf. iii. 30). Instead of *hath become*, we should rather have expected *will become* or *is to become*. The Greek γέγονεν may be due to the translator's having supplied a wrong vowel to the Aramaic הוי, reading it as הֲוֵי (the *Perfect*) instead of הָוֵי (the *Participle*), either of which it might represent in the unpointed text. Further, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν, '*because he was before me*,' may also be due in part to misunderstanding. The Aramaic קדמי (pointed קֳדָמַי or קְדָמַי), which means 'first,' may have been confused with the exactly similar קדמי (קָדָמַי), 'before me.' The original text may have been:

דְּאָתֵי בַּתְרַי קָדָמַי הֲוֵי
מְטוֹל דְּקַדְמַי הוּא׃

'*He who is coming after me, before me will become; Because he was the first* (*of all*)':

i.e. because He existed '*in the Beginning*' (בקדמין, v.[1]).

The characteristic assonance between the two kindred words should be noted. It is thoroughly Semitic. The whole saying seems to be a kind of riddle or paradox, like '*The last shall be first, and the first last*' (Mt 20[16]).

The second utterance of the Baptist, to which I would call attention here, is the cry, '*Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away* (or *beareth*) *the sin of the world!*' (v.[29]). It is a saying consecrated by long ages of liturgical use, and endeared to us by religious associations and experience. Yet it sounds very strange, if not altogether improbable, in the mouth of the Baptist at this early period. It antedates that doctrine of the Suffering Messiah,

which only came home to the Apostles themselves after the Resurrection (Lk $24^{21.26}$). It does not well harmonize with the general tone of the Baptist's teaching about the Messiah, as reported by the Synoptists (Mt 3). Moreover, it is repeated (v.[36]) in the briefer and perhaps more authentic form, '*Behold the Lamb of God!*' The remainder of v.[29] may therefore be supposed to have been added by some editor of the Greek text who recollected Is 53^{7}, and who wrote in the light of a later stage of Christian knowledge. But what are we to make of the expression '*The Lamb of God*,' to which it seems almost inevitable to attach a sacrificial implication (cf. Gn 22^{8})? The Aramaic may again help us. Here we find a word טַלְיָא, which means 'lamb,' but also 'young,' 'boy,' 'young man,' 'servant.' Thus it denotes Abraham's 'young men' (Gn 22^{3}), and the centurion's 'servant' (Mt $8^{6.13}$). The plur. is used in the Targum of Ps 17^{14} for 'children' (= Heb. עוללים). Possibly, therefore, what the Baptist really said was הא טליא די אלהא, *Behold the Young Servant* or *the Child of God!* One might be inclined to modify the form of the phrase, so as to get the sense *a Divine* (or *godlike*) *youth* (cf. *cedars of God*, Ps 80^{11}). But the express statement attributed to the Baptist a little further on in the narrative (v.[34]), '*And I have seen and testified that He is* the Son of God' (= the Messianic King), seems to corroborate the former construction. Even if the word rendered ἀμνὸς were the Aramaic אִמְּרָא, 'lamb,' it is still conceivable that the meaning might be 'child' or 'son'; for although no instance of such a use of אמר can be cited from the Aramaic documents known to us, yet the word is actually so used in Assyrian (*immeru*, 'lamb' 'sheep'; also 'son,' 2 R. 36. 53; *immertu*, 'ewe'; also 'daughter,' 2 R. 30. 51; cf. 2 S 12^{3}). Indeed, Hilprecht suggested some years ago that ἀμνὸς = υἱὸς in Jn 1^{29}, on the analogy of the Assyrian use (see Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*, *s.v.* 'I-me-ir-ilu,' p. 107).

Two other passages in the same chapter may be adduced as pointing generally in the same direction. In v.[5] the statement that the (primeval) Darkness '*comprehended* not' the Light, is strange. It is true that the Greek αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν might bear the meaning 'quelled it not' (cf. Hdt. i. 87). But it seems better to suppose an original Aramaic term אקביל, *darkened*, which the Greek translator confused with the similar קביל, *took* or *received* (v.[11], Pesh.). *And the darkness darkened it not* is a thoroughly Semitic mode of expression; exhibiting, as it does, a characteristic assonance between the noun and the verb. The original verse might have run somewhat thus:

וּנְהוֹרָא בְּקַבְלָא מַנְהַר
וְקַבְלָא יְתֵיהּ לָא אַקְבֵּיל׃

And the Light in the Darkness was shining;
And the Darkness bedimmed not It.

The other passage, v.[11], looks like a translation. The curious εἰς τὰ ἴδια . . . καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι seem to be best accounted for by supposing that the original term was the same in each case, namely, the Aramaic ביתיה, *his house* or *kindred* (Ex 1^{21}, *et sæp.*). At all events, the Hebrew אל־ביתו, *unto his house*, is actually rendered εἰς τὰ ἴδια in Est 5^{10} 6^{12} (Sept.).

And here, for the present, we may leave the argument, in the hope that it may at least prove a stimulus to further investigation.

C. J. Ball.

Blechingdon Rectory, Oxford.

The Corpse Candle.

Anent the Corpse Candle, mentioned in The Expository Times for October, it may interest you to know that, as the result of many investigations into this phenomenon in Wales, I some years ago came to the conclusion that the light is seen mainly by persons who belong to the race (Iberian, Celtic, or Goidelic, or whatever it may be) which is represented by the Cardiganshire type of man. Those who have seen this light, wherever they may live, have Cardiganshire blood in their veins. But what is the light? I do not think that it has any objective existence, but that it is the form which a mental impression of a coming death takes in the brains of those who see the light. Why or how people should thus visualize internal and subjective impressions or messages we know not. Nor can any one say why some persons should have the forecast months or even a year (as in the case quoted) ahead. When we come to know more of the gift possessed by many, of seeing into the future, that which our fathers called 'prophecy,' we shall perhaps at the same time learn the laws of its

operation. All I want men to think of now is the probability of mental operations of definite kinds being the peculiarities of certain races. Some years ago a clergyman in Wales told me that in his youth he was staying at a farm where one night some young men were expected to pay a visit, but whose presence was undesirable. To frighten them away my friend went out of the house late in the evening, about the time the men were expected to be on the road, and walked about the fields with a lighted candle on his head, in a flat-bottomed candlestick. He did this on the supposition that the young men, seeing the weird light and mysterious movement, would get nervous and retire. His plan succeeded. They saw the light, and went home believing they had seen Canwyl Corph. But the odd thing is that a death did take place in that farmhouse within a fortnight of the experiment with the candle. The person who died was not ill at the time of the experiment. This was, perhaps, merely a coincidence, but then —What is coincidence? Was the trick due to a sub-conscious suggestion on the part of one in the house who possessed prescience?

A. T. Fryer.

St. James's Vicarage, Walthamstow.

Hebrews iii. 8, 15.

'As in the provocation' was left unchanged by the R.V. in the N.T., while in Ps 95^8 the Revisers changed it to 'as at *Meribah*,' with the note, 'that is *strife*.' In the articles 'Meribah' and 'Provocation' (*D.B.*) there is missing the hint, that the translation παραπικρασμός rests on a confusion of *Meribah* (Ex 17^7) with *Marah* (Ex 15^{23}). Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

LOT[8].

The letters are familiar, but the figure is new. *LOT* stands for Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, and the small superior figure means that that book has reached its eighth edition. It is a great record. In a new preface to the new edition, Professor Driver draws attention to the progress which the critical study of the Old Testament has made within the last ten or twelve years. But the best proof of that progress is his own book.

The sixth edition was re-set. With the eighth edition that has not been necessary, but it is a thorough revision. The literature has been brought up to date throughout. We notice several entries belonging to the present year. Then there are some additional notes, which, although they are brief, are of the utmost importance. Two at least of the notes make use of the recent discovery or publication of inscriptions which throw light upon the languages used in the Old Testament. There is a note of this kind on p. 153 ff., which contains all that the student of the Bible needs to know about recent contributions to the study of the language of Daniel—a marvellous note for compactness aud clearness combined. We wondered if Dr. Driver had seen the articles which appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review* in 1904 and 1905 on 'Royal Titles in Antiquity.' Another compact note at the very end of the volume answers them.

These additions are valuable. But other ten years of study have done nothing to suggest that the book should be altered essentially.

Saints as Gods.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have published another book by Dr. Ross of Manchuria. It is worth buying for its binding alone; but we cannot all afford to buy binding. It must be bought for the great interest in the study of Religion in our day, and for the fact that it is the only convenient and complete account in our language of the earliest Religion of China.

Dr. Ross surpasses himself in this book. He has cut out all irrelevancies and repetitions. He has risen to the height of a really great descriptive style. To the English resident in China his book will be indispensable. To the student of Religion it will be scarcely less necessary. To the student of men it will be a surprise and delight. What a revelation it is of the kinship of the whole world. 'What we believe to be the spirit of the devout Roman Catholic is precisely the spirit of the

ancient Chinese as we find it in the Book of History and the Book of Odes.' When he has said that, Dr. Ross proceeds to give an account of the saints, or angels, or inferior deities (the name does not seem to matter) to whom the Chinese look for aid and whom they worship, without for a moment dreaming that they are doing anything inconsistent with the worship of the Supreme God. There are traces, it is true, in China of Roman Catholicism that has forgotten its origin, such as the worship of the Queen of Heaven, a modern introduction and probably an adaptation of the worship of the Virgin Mary. But the worship of the inferior deities of China belongs to the most ancient period of all.

The title of the book is *The Original Religion of China* (5s. net).

It will be convenient to notice here some other books which Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have published this month. They arrived too late for their place in the Literature. The most important is a translation of Warneck's *Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums*. This is the book which was so fully and admirably reviewed by Professor Paterson in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for October. It is enough now, therefore, to say that the translation is made from the third German edition, and that it is a very good translation.

Other volumes received are (1) *Truths of To-day: A Young Man's Creed*, by Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A. (2s. 6d. net); (2) *The Child in the Church*, by W. M'Neill, B.A. (1s. 6d. net); (3) *Satan and the Saint; or, The Present Darkness and the Coming Light*, by the Rev. James M. Gray, D.D. (1s. 6d. net). Dr. Gray and Mr. Mackinnon are authors with whom we are acquainted. Mr. M'Neill is new to us. He is minister of Adelaide Road Presbyterian Church, Dublin. His book has to do with a subject which is making many of us very uneasy at present, so haphazard is the dealing of the Church of to-day with children. It is not, of course, the question of infant baptism. Mr. M'Neill is not so greatly exercised about that, though he has a chapter on it. The matter of most importance is how the child may realize his membership in the Church. It is an amazing commentary on our conception of the subject, that a phrase like 'joining the Church' should still be used by us.

But there is another. If it has not attained to the dignity of a book, it is an indispensable accompaniment of one of the most familiar books in Scotland. It is called *Companion to the Church Hymnary*. First of all it contains a concordance to the subject-matter, themes, and poetical images employed in the hymns. And then it offers an index to the Scripture references. Something of this kind should be done for every hymn-book that is largely in use. This is the first time, so far as we know, that it has been done scientifically. The author is the Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E., of St. Leonard's United Free Church, Perth.

Black and White.

If we all sinned in Adam, how are we responsible? If we did not all sin in Adam, how is it that we all sin? Mr. W. B. Norris has found a solution for this ancient problem. This is the way he puts his solution: 'One end of our unstable oscillating heart is self-seeking, the other end of it is self-sacrificing; at the black end is our false self, trying to induce our will to let up black by weighing down white; at the white end is our true self trying to induce us to let up white by weighing down black. We did not put these two selves in our hearts, we found them there, hence for their presence in us we are not responsible; but for the present *position* of black and of white in our hearts, up or down, we *are* responsible.'

Other men seem to be of the same opinion, many other men; for *A Key to Life's Mystery* (Simpkin Marshall), which is the title of the book, is almost entirely made up of extracts. Mr. Norris is particularly fond of George Herbert. Here is a verse from one of the quotations:

> Although there were some forty heav'ns, or more,
> Sometimes I peer above them all;
> Sometimes I hardly reach a score;
> Sometimes to hell I fall.

Carnal Formalities.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England, with kindred Records, edited with Introduction and Notes for the Baptist Historical Society by W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S. Vol. I. (Kingsgate Press).

That is the full title-page. The volume is admirably edited; for Dr. Whitley is one of the

small band who still find the history of the Church in this land a congenial study.

Here is a literal transcript of Dr. Whitley's literal transcript from the Minutes of the General Assembly of 1689. The question in debate is whether the congregation should join in the praise of God.

'The psons holding the Affirmative in this Question were desired to show us what Psalmes they made use of for the matter & what rules they did settle upon for the manner. Hereupon was produced not the Meeters composed by Mr. Steerhold & Mr. Hopkins, but a book of Meeters composed by one Mr. Barton And the rules used to sing these petitions by also set down secundum artem vizt. as the Musician do sing according to their Gammut sol-fa-la my-Re-ut &c. All which appeared so strangly foreign to the Evangellicall worship that it was not conceived anyways safe for the Churches to admit to such Carnall formalities But to rest satisfied in this till we can see something more Perfect in this case, That as Prayer of one in the Church is the Prayer of the whole Church so the singing of one in the Church is the singing of the whole Church, and as he that prayeth in the Church is to pforme the Service as of the ability wch. God giveth even so he that singeth praises in the Church ought to pforme that Service as of the Ability reced. of God & as a mournfull voice becomes the Duty of prayer so a Joyfull voice with gravity becomes the Duty of Praiseing God with a song in the Church of God This is the sum of what passed wth. ye generall Approbacon of the representatives of the Assembly in this prticular.'

In an Orchard.

February.

I heard the tree complaining:
'Oh, this incessant raining!
My branches bleak and bare—
So cold! God does not care!'—
I heard the tree complaining.

October.

I heard the tree regretting:
'O God, forgive my fretting!
My cup it runneth o'er;
Faith ne'er shall fail me more!'
I heard the tree regretting.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. F. W. Boreham, Hobart, Tasmania, to whom a copy of Law's *Tests of Life* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for December must be received by the 1st of November. The text is Rev 7^{14}.

The Great Text for January is Rev 14^{13}—'And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works follow with them.' A copy of Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for February is Rev 20^{12}—'And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works.' A copy of Law's *Tests of Life* or Newton Clarke's *Doctrine of God* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Rev 21^{1}—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more.' A copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, or Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Forrest's *Christ of History and of Experience*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for April is Rev 21^{5}—'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Holborn's *Architectures of European Religions*, or Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE second volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS may be expected this month. It is already out of the hands of the authors and editors.

The volume contains articles by one hundred and sixty-nine different authors, of whom one hundred and twenty-five have written only a single article each. This will give some idea of the trouble that has been taken to make the work reliable. The purpose of the Encyclopædia is to enable preachers or teachers, who have to touch on subjects with which they are not at home, to obtain an account of these subjects written by experts, and, while succinct, sufficiently full for their purpose. By means of the scholarship of the authors and the work done by the editors and assistants, the attempt is made to reach a higher standard of excellence than has hitherto obtained in encyclopædias.

The number of articles is two hundred and sixty-five. The shortest article is probably not less than a column in length. For the subjects dealt with in this Encyclopædia are all subjects of importance, and require space for their treatment. Except the cross-references there is not a line in the volume that could be rudely described as 'hack-work.' Some one has said that every book is a nut with a kernel, the kernel being usually quite small, and all the rest husk—the printers call it 'fluff.' Each of these articles is a book with the fluff omitted. If the subject is folk-lore, it would take a large volume with its fluff to say all that is said in the article on Bridges by Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Andrew LANG would write a considerable volume on Bull-roarer and say no more than he has compressed into his article here. Many volumes have been written on the Brahma Samaj, but there is nothing worth knowing about that modern and menacing movement that will not be found in Mr. FARQUHAR'S article. There is just one authority worth naming on the Babis, whose religion has attracted so much attention in the West, and Professor Edward BROWNE tells everything that can be told about them in ten pages. Professor Edward WESTERMARCK is astonished at his own self-denial when he gave up the opportunity of a great book on the history of Asylums throughout the world for the sake of a single article here.

Mr. Israel ABRAHAMS, having a name that deserves it, heads the list of authors. He writes on Blasphemy and on the Body. Among the other Jewish authors are Dr. GASTER, Chief Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregations in London, who writes a most interesting and original article on Jewish religious customs connected with the Birth of children; and Professor GOLDZIHER

of Budapest, probably the greatest authority in our day on Muhammadanism. Many other religious professions are represented in the authorship. For now the student of Religion always prefers to read an article which has been written from within. If any discount has to be made on the ground of excess of sympathy, he can make it for himself. And the editors will see to it that accurate references are given for all the statements in the article.

Mr. ABRAHAMS has written two articles. One of them is an article on the conception of the Body found in the Old Testament. For, while the Encyclopædia presupposes the possession of a Dictionary of the Bible, and therefore does not deal with matters of geography or antiquities, yet it will contain articles on everything in the Old Testament that is of religious or ethical importance. And these articles will receive an enhanced value from the fact that they will be found side by side with articles showing how the same subject is treated in other religions. There could scarcely be a more instructive study than the comparison of the Hebrew conception of the Body with the Greek and Roman conception; though scarcely less striking is the comparison with the Egyptian ideas. One does not study these articles simply to discover differences. More instructive are the similarities. And it is well to recognize the fact that no one can discuss profitably either the Old Testament or the New Testament conception of the Body without first reading such an introductory article as Professor WHEELER ROBINSON offers here, and then passing to the contrasts and comparisons which are made with the ideas obtaining in other religions.

Who are the authors of Old and New Testament subjects in this volume? Professor BARTLET, of Mansfield College, Oxford, writes on Baptism in the New Testament. The article on the obscure subject of Baptism among the Jews in the time of our Lord is written by Professor BRANDT of Amsterdam. Dean BERNARD of Dublin writes on Assumption and Ascension; and Mr. BISSEKER, of the Leysian Mission, London, on Brotherly Love. Professor SANDAY has written an article on the Bible, which is followed by an article on the Bible in the Church by Professor VON DOBSCHÜTZ of Strassburg. These two great scholars have worked in co-operation, or at least with a clear understanding of one another's position. Both articles will be found instructive and inspiring, perhaps beyond any others that the volume contains. And this being so, the difference in their style is astonishing. There is also an article on Bibliolatry by a man who inherits a great name—Professor August DORNER of Königsberg.

There is an article by Dr. JEREMIAS of Leipzig which will attract attention. Its subject is the Book of Life. Professor NESTLE writes on Azazel, such an article as he alone can write, minute, indispensable. Beside it must be considered the articles by Professor BARTON and Professor PATON, articles dealing mostly with the gods that are mentioned in the Old Testament, a subject which no purely Biblical scholar has ever much confidence in handling. One of the two great religions coming within the scope of the volume is that of the Babylonians and Assyrians, a religion which affects the study of the Old Testament intimately. The article has been written by Professor ZIMMERN of Leipzig. The other great religion is that of the Aryans, on which Professor Otto SCHRADER of Breslau has written the longest article in the volume. It is a study in religious development for which alone the price of this volume might have been charged if it had been published separately.

The number of foreign authors is inevitably large. There are eighteen from Germany, six from France, five from Holland, two from Spain, two from Belgium, two from Finland, and from Italy, Austria, Sweden, Japan, one each. These articles have had to be translated. And the translation of an encyclopædia article is not like the translation of an article for a magazine. The translator has to know the subject as well as the

language. He must render his author with the utmost accuracy; and the editor insists upon a translation being as easily read as an original writing.

There is no part of the volume that is likely to be of more value to the preacher than the ethical work. The ethical topics falling within this volume are more remarkable for their elusiveness than for their prominence, and reliable literature upon them has been hard to find. Professor DAVIDSON has written on Awe, Miss EDGELL on Association, Professor EHRHARDT on Autonomy, Mr. GASKELL on Attachment, the late Professor John DAVIDSON on Boycotting, Principal IVERACH on Attention and on Authority, Professor KILPATRICK on Benevolence, Professor MARVIN of Princeton University on Attraction and Repulsion, Professor CLARK MURRAY on Bigotry, Mr. Robert MURRAY of Dublin on Blackmail, Professor OMAN on Boasting, Mr. SCHILLER on Automatism, Mr. RUSSELL SCOTT on Boldness, Professor ARMITAGE SMITH on Barter, Mr. MACRAE TOD on Avarice, Mr. Benjamin WHITEHEAD on Brawling. And closely associated with these are the psychological articles, such as Professor STARBUCK'S article on Backsliding, and Professor Maurice DE WULF'S article on Beauty. Closely associated also, but on the physiological side, are the articles by Professor BLAND-SUTTON on Atrophy, by Dr. DRUMMOND on Blindness, by Professor J. Y. SIMPSON on Biology, and by Professor J. Arthur THOMSON on Atavism and on Biogenesis.

The Encyclopædia, we have said, presupposes a Dictionary of the Bible. It also completes it. It follows the ideas of the Old and New Testament throughout their fortunes in the history of the Church. It serves the purpose of a Dictionary of the Church. For there are articles not only on all religious and ethical ideas and practices, but also on all the customs and folk-lore that have been so important a part of the religious life of Christianity, and on all the persons who have made their mark on its history.

Professor Sanday has written a criticism of Mr. F. C. Conybeare's *Myth, Magic, and Morals*. He has written it, not as a reviewer of books, nor at the solicitation of any editor, but simply from his own sense of the situation which the book has created. He has published his criticism in pamphlet form, under the title of *A New Marcion* (Longmans; 1s. net).

Professor Sanday and Mr. Conybeare are both Oxford men. The situation which the book has created has been created in Oxford. It may not be confined to Oxford. Professor Sanday does not think that it is. But he knows that, if also elsewhere, certainly in Oxford, there is on the one hand a strong Christian movement, and on the other hand a good deal of quiet estrangement from Christianity. The Christian movement is not only hopeful but active. The estrangement is at the present time less realized, floating opinion rather than formed conviction. The danger is that Mr. Conybeare's book may do something to encourage that floating opinion to precipitate itself in forms of active opposition.

That is Dr. Sanday's reason for answering the book. There are smaller reasons. Mr. Conybeare, he says, has 'one little rub against myself.' He has also some exceedingly trenchant things to say of the class to which Dr. Sanday belongs. 'We of the Church of England, especially the higher officers of the Church, have our portraits painted pretty plainly.' Dr. Sanday quotes two specimens. Of the last specimen this is the last sentence: 'When Anglican bishops meet together in council they talk and write as if religious life was impossible unless it be based on a quiet, but wholesale, suppression of truth.'

'This sentence,' says Professor Sanday, 'explains at once the whole attitude and temper of the book.' 'Truth,' he adds, 'is taken to mean not exactly what a man troweth, but what the particular author of this book troweth.' And then he says, 'It is not a rare phenomenon to find an author

identifying his own opinions with truth in the abstract, and those of all who differ from him with abstract falsehood; but I do not think that I have ever seen the identification made with such perfect *naïveté* and such serene assurance.'

There is one part of Mr. Conybeare's book which has given Dr. Sanday pleasure. It is his literary criticism of the New Testament. All the Epistles ascribed to St. Paul are accepted as genuine, even including the Pastorals. The Epistle to the Hebrews is regarded as clearly anterior to 70 A.D. The Book of Revelation was composed about the year 93, but an earlier document of 68 or 69 may be worked up in it. St. John's Gospel is placed about 110, to which Dr. Sanday demurs; but he knows that Mr. Conybeare has many scholars with him. The Synoptic question is handled quite judiciously.

Dr. Sanday finds that on the literary data there is very little difference between Mr. Conybeare and himself. The difference begins when Mr. Conybeare begins to draw his conclusions, and the difference is then very great. Professor Sanday calls it portentous. For he says it is a question of faith or no faith. It is not even a question of Christianity or theism. Mr. Conybeare's arguments are directed against both at once. 'It is in some ways a curious position. Twenty-five or thirty years ago similar doctrines were being preached by the late Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant with no small endowment of mother wit, but with a scanty equipment of special knowledge. Mr. Conybeare has no lack of this; and yet he carries on exactly the same line of succession.' And Dr. Sanday finds it significant, as we did, that the book is published by the Rationalist Press Association, the recognized agency of the iconoclastic propaganda.

'Naturally,' says Professor Sanday (and with this paragraph we send our readers to his pamphlet), 'we expect from one who occupies so high a pedestal, from a scholar who has so many real qualifications for adding to knowledge, some permanent contribution to a philosophy of life, some enlightening conception which shall help to unify thought and solve its perplexities. I can only say that any one who entertains such expectations will be woefully disappointed. The positive outcome of the book is nothing, and less than nothing. It is the merest *Rationalismus vulgaris*, such as would have been in place in the early years of the French Revolution and at no other time before or since. The book leaves upon us the impression of a petulant child who has taken to pieces his toy and cannot put it together again. The only real interest in the writer's mind seems to be the exploding of what he considers superstition, the propagation of these purely negative beliefs which he labels 'Truth' in such large letters. In fact, he aims at doing just what the radicals of thirty years ago aimed at, with more of a scholar's knowledge, but with no more real insight and—must it not be said?—with no more civilized manners.'

The Rev. J. R. P. Sclater, M.A., is minister of the New North Church in Edinburgh. Dr. John Kelman was minister of the New North Church before him; and for a time, when Mr. Sclater was spoken of, he was spoken of as Dr. Kelman's successor. That was never necessary to those who knew him. It is no longer necessary to any one.

Mr. Sclater is a student of Meredith. He is a student of Meredith's poetry. The book which he has published through Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, and called *The Sons of Strength* (1s. net), is an exposition of Meredith's message, his message through his poetry, to the present time. Mr. Sclater accepts the message for himself, and passes it on.

It is a call to be strong. Being a preacher, Mr. Sclater takes a text to start from. His text is 'The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence; and

the violent take it by force' (Mt 11^{12}). We shall have to consider that text. Mr. Sclater takes it simply to start from. He says that the late F. W. H. Myers somewhere puts up a prayer after this manner: 'From the torpor of a foul tranquillity may our souls be delivered unto war.' George Meredith made that prayer his own. He will make it ours if we give him a hearing. We owe it to him that he has impressed upon us the need of strong effort; and yet more, that he has done this without appealing to the hopelessness of things, without portraying our present condition in a blackness which tends to breed despair. He has told us, as Browning has also told us, that life is good, 'the mere joy of living.' Or, as Chesterton is telling us still, that 'Life is already a very splendid thing. Let us, therefore, make it better.'

To Mr. Sclater this message is welcome. He is weary of the Cassandras who are born blind to existing good and to the reasonableness of gladness. And if he is weary of Cassandras, prophesying darkness, he is still more weary, and with a fuller justification, of the innumerable unnamed prophets who take no delight in strife.

Meredith rejoices in the strength that delights in strife. It is the battle-energy in him that is his first attractiveness. He loves strength, and welcomes occasions for the use of it. To him man is

> A creature matched with strife
> To meet it as a bride.

In the presence of death itself he would have us show the brave front. When the last shadow had begun to fall upon one very dear to him, it was her

> Fortitude, quiet as Earth's
> At the shedding of leaves,

that he noted and set in remembrance. And so, loving strength, and loving the occasion for the exercise of it, he loves those happenings that come to us from without and have a sharpening effect, all that

> . . . may give us edging keen,
> String us for battle, till as play
> The common strokes of fortune shower.

Now, all this insistence on strength, and on the strife that breeds strength, is not unchristian. More unchristian, though it is so common in our hymn-books, is the conception that this present life is a vale of woe, and that fearfulness is an attribute of sainthood. Says Mr. Sclater: 'When a hymn-writer needs to exhort "fearful saints" to take fresh courage, when songs of devotion mourn, not sin, but the circumstances of living which are the expression of the Perfect Will, there is clear necessity for a recall to that attitude of joyous acceptance of hardness, which ought to be the natural outgrowth of Christian faith. Fearfulness, however excusable in many common circumstances, should be recognized as the mark of a state not yet perfectly sanctified. Indeed, the term "fearful saint" should be acknowledged to be as paradoxical as "irritable saint." It stands parallel to such a name as "distrustful believer."'

Well, this seems all right. It is worth saying, and it is well said. We beat our applause, and loud applause. But before the sound of our applause has ceased, Mr. Sclater has challenged us to put it into practice. And he has challenged us to put it into practice by entering life, by sending our sons and daughters into life, into society, by just running those risks, and allowing our children to run those risks, which so many good Christian people are telling us every day that we have no right to run.

Mr. Sclater is satisfied that the Church of Christ is not called to the use of negatives. The great commandment is 'Thou shalt,' not 'Thou shalt not.' 'The fact is,' he says, 'that when the Church begins to set forth what a man should be in terms of "thou shalt not" rather than of "thou shalt," it is whimpering to the world that it has lost its nerve. At the present time, part of the alleged detachment of youth from the Church may be explained simply on the

47,386

ground that the most vocal section of the Church, which is taken to be representative of it, is hesitating a doubt whether it is safe to dare to lay hold on life: a thing which our young, although they do not so phrase it to themselves, are most surely resolved to do.'

But there is a distinction. There is a difference between the enjoyment of life of the Christian and the enjoyment of life of the man in the street. For the ideal of the Church is always strong in one respect: always it involves flesh-mastery by the spirit, whereas the ideal of the man in the street frequently involves no such thing. His ideal involves courage and honour certainly, but in a restricted sense. He need not show courage in the face of temptation that is hidden. He need have no sense of honour to God. For the matter of that, he need have very little sense of honour towards women. Provided that he does not run away when he is shot at, and that he does not cheat at cards, he has fulfilled the Law and the Prophets according to the teaching of the market-place.

No, there is one thing more. The man of the street must be genial. And geniality is good. But Mr. Sclater thinks that it may be overpraised. As a mark of ethical attainment he thinks that the praise of it may be easily overdone. For 'geniality and graciousness of bearing are a matter of temperament and endowment, and are not in the least inconsistent with a good deal of rascaldom. It is quite simple to smile and smile and be a villain. The Prodigal Son, I make no doubt, was the most popular person in his village; and many a scamp since him has made assemblies shine. The Sons of Strength cannot always command the gayest laugh. Often, to their own sorrow, they may lack the faculty of easy sympathy. Nevertheless, it is they, and not those who are born popular, who are Earth's chosen offspring ever.'

And the Christian who striveth for the mastery is to be distinguished from another. He is to be distinguished not only from the man of the world, but also from the unclassed looker-on. Unclassed, because he may be within the Church or without it. And he is of many types: from the man who is too intelligent to consider anything definitely wrong and definitely requiring eradication, to the good-natured but futile person who, while sympathizing with efforts for the extension of the Kingdom of God, is too inert to do any of the spade-work himself. Within the Church, says Mr. Sclater, none tends more to the ineffectiveness of the society as a whole—not even those who stand in direct opposition—than the apathetic fringe. They are the murderers of the Church's enthusiasms.

Now when Mr. Sclater has vindicated the place of the Strong in the Church of Christ, he turns to consider their nature. And he finds (still following Meredith the poet) that they have three marks upon them: (1) the mark of Unity; (2) the mark of the Love of the Real; (3) the mark of Assent.

They have first the mark of Unity. 'All things are yours . . . *life*.' For man is a body as well as a mind, and must propose completion in respect of both. Meredith stands equally opposed to the sensualist and to the ascetic. Body and mind? There is spirit also. Mr. Sclater does not name it. But it is included in the quotation which he immediately makes from Meredith. For Meredith, not troubled with word-formations,—trichotomy dichotomy, and the like,—finds man composed of 'blood and brain and spirit,' and insists that to deny any one of these its place in his constitution is to expect disaster.

> Blood and brain and spirit, three
> (Say the deepest gnomes of Earth),
> Join for true felicity.
> Are they parted, then expect
> Some one sailing will be wrecked:
> Separate hunting are they sped,
> Scan the morsel coveted.
> Earth that Triad is: she hides
> Joy from him who that divides;
> Showers it when the three are one
> Glassing her in union.

The passage is difficult; Mr. Sclater admits it. But whatever else it means, it means this, that when the body desires without the consent of the mind, or the mind covets without the consent of the spirit, or even when the spirit craves without regard to the mind and the body, then the thing so desired, coveted, or craved is a thing not wholly acceptable. It is a morsel, as Mr. Sclater puts it, which needs to be eyed carefully. If pursued to attainment, the chances are that there will be wrecking somewhere.

Mr. Sclater does not think that this is the time to start a crusade against the crucifixion of the flesh. In many respects, he says, this is an easy day. A little more asceticism in practice would do most of us no harm. But, for all that, let us keep before us the ideal. And the ideal is Meredith's 'blood and brain and spirit,' these three.

The next mark which the Strong possess is the Love of the Real. 'And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' For it is the imaginary that unnerves us. The real, when we have reached it, we are always able to accept. Meredith is an optimist, an optimist in feeling as well as in thought. But he looks fair and square in the face the darker facts of our living.

Overhead, overhead
Rushes life in a race,
As the clouds the clouds chase;
And we go
And we drop like the fruits of the tree,
Even we,
Even so.

It may be that to recognize facts as facts does not carry us far. Still, it is wise to recognize facts as facts. It is the imagination, we say, that unnerves. The presence of the fact braces us for the conflict with it. 'When a man bares himself to the truth, and permits it to grip him, the act of so doing makes him strong for any circumstances. It is the lesson,' says Mr. Sclater, 'which another taught us when He said, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." A text this for all who are engaged in moral teaching to ponder. Get a man convinced of the great facts—of Sin, of Pardon, of Christ, and of the Indwelling Power—let it come upon his mind one day that these things are *true*—and behold! he is set free.'

The third mark of the Strong is the mark of Assent. 'Thy will be done.' This is the step that succeeds the acknowledgment of the truth. It is its acceptance. And the acceptance of the truth, that is to say, of the will of God—never mind whether Meredith would say God or not, we say it—the acceptance of the will of God, we say, is not resignation. At least, it is not resignation in the weakened meaning to which that fine word has lately fallen. Meredith emphasizes resignation. But it is not the acceptance of the will of God because we cannot help it. It is making the will of God our will. It may at the beginning be, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.' But at the end it is, 'I delight to do thy will, O my God.'

And how is this splendid power of Assent to be reached? Here Meredith gives us an entirely Christian word. It is to be reached by the slaughter of self. In the emphasis upon self he finds the primal source of all the world's fears. If our experience is sore, it is God (Meredith says Earth) that is wrestling

with our old worm
Self in the narrow and wide.

And now we come to the Encouragements. This is the third part of Mr. Sclater's book. His own word is 'Inspirations.' For Meredith does not teach us that we can scale the heights of goodness unaided. There are inspirations, of which it may be more truly said that they seize the man, than that the man seizes them. And what are the inspirations to the achievement of worth? Mr. Sclater discovers two—the Companionship and the Forward View.

There is the Companionship. 'I have called you friends.' 'Lo, I am with you alway.' Now, to those who know not Meredith it will seem strange that he should find his companionship in Nature, his companionship first and last. But Earth (with its capital letter) is to Meredith the visible presence of that which we call God. So when faith's keenest ordeal came upon him, in the loss of one who made the world glad,

> The changeful visible face
> Of our Mother I sought for my food.

And in any wise, it is the man in whom the Spirit has so far gained the mastery who finds sustenance there. The flesh-controlled are not at home in Nature. Mr. Sclater says it is not pressing the thought too much to quote the old words with this emphasis: 'Who shall ascend into the *hill* of the Lord? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.'

Moreover, communion with Nature demands effort. Meredith definitely sought Nature in his distress. 'Our Mother I *sought* for my food.' And behind that particular effort referred to in 'A Faith on Trial' there stood a whole lifetime of purposeful communion. In his moment of need, he tells us, he had but one asset left, and that was his 'disciplined habit to see.' As it proved, that was sufficient; but apart from that disciplined habit, the inspiration which finally came to him would not have been his. He contributed his share to the Companionship by deliberately *attending* to the word of God in Earth.

But there is also the Forward View. 'The things which God hath prepared for them that love him.' Here at last there is in Meredith not only some surprise but much defect. He has hope. His religion does not rest in the present; it reaches into the future. But his hope is for the future of the race. He has no hope for the individual. He even wages war upon the desire for individual immortality, holding it to be a desire essentially selfish.

Nevertheless, even Meredith will have man live in the light of the everlasting, and in that light do his work. Even if the immortality is only in the race, it is an immortality of inspiration.

> 'The young generation! ah, there is the child
> Of our souls down the Ages! to bleed for it, proof
> That souls we have.'

And what is the kind of work that the forward view inspires us to do? Meredith puts emphasis upon it in three directions. First, it is work that is *effective*. 'Nought writ on sand.' Second, it is work that has effect on the *living*. What we are and what we do is perpetuated in lives. Third, it is work which fits in to a great process of *development*—belief in the increasing purpose that runs through the ages translating itself into act; or, in Meredith's own language, 'the dream of the blossom of good' shaping its own fulfilment.

> 'Full lasting is the song, though he,
> The singer, passes: lasting too,
> For souls not lent in usury,
> The rapture of the forward view.'

The Revival of Kenoticism.

By the Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, M.A., D.Phil., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in New College, Edinburgh.

Certain phenomena in the most recent history of British dogmatics appear to justify one in speaking of a resuscitation of interest in what are usually known as the Kenotic theories of our Lord's person. Nor is this renascence at all surprising. For the criticism aimed at the Kenotic hypothesis, on its first announcement—though often described as having been of a shattering description—does not impress the reader of a later day as being either particularly sympathetic or particularly far-sighted. Some of the arguments had that very bad quality in an argument, that they proved too much. They failed also to allow for the distinction between a principle and the forms in which it may be applied.

The differential feature of Kenotic views is, to quote a recent writer, that they seek 'to do justice to the truth that the Incarnation of the Son of God involved a real self-limitation of His divine mode of existence.' Somehow—it is quite felt that we may not be able to describe the method with exactness—He brought His greatness down to the measures of our life, becoming poor for our sake. Advocates of Kenoticism take this seriously, and in consequence try to find a place for the real fact it must denote in their construction of the incarnate life. They refuse to surround or accompany it with qualifications that virtually cancel it. They are aware, of course, of the difficulties attaching to their own view; but since on any showing the difficulties of reason are here immense, they prefer that doctrine which both conserves the vital stake of religion in the real descent of God (*Deus humilis*) and keeps most closely to the concrete particulars of the historic record. These facts plainly constitute the only revelation we possess, and it is no merit in a Christological theory, but the reverse, that it claims to deal successfully with remoter questions of ontology not forced upon us by the representations of the New Testament—such as the relation of a divine Person to the powers or qualities belonging to Him—while it makes the record itself dubious or unintelligible. Our only use for a theory is to synthesize the facts actually before us, not to do something else. That is not truly a knife which fails to cut wood, though as a trowel it is excellent.

Sixty years ago the conceptions of Thomasius and Gess were brought forward under the influence of a variety of motives. Their authors had, like other moderns, been impressed by the fact that the Jesus of the Gospels, whatever more, is in very deed our fellow-man, and this created a desire to give accentuated expression, at all costs, to the reality and integrity of His manhood. But still more, they aimed at bringing out the wonder of His humiliation. What the Gospel proclaims is the redeeming sacrifice of God, with the Cross as the climax of all else; so dear were human souls to Him that He travelled far and stooped low that He might touch and lift up the needy. It is a thought to which the heart thrills again: Christ came from such a height, and to such a depth! He took our human frailty to be His own. *He became poor;* that is an unheard-of truth, casting an amazing light on God; a light, however, whose glory is not enhanced but diminished rather if you straightway add that nevertheless He remained rich all the time. For in so far as He remained rich—in the same sense of riches—and gave up nothing to be near us, our need of a Divine Helper to bear our sicknesses and carry our sorrows would be still unmet. What we require is the love that shows itself in action, 'entering,' as it has been put, 'into conditions that are foreign to it in order to prove its quality.' Now this is what we see when we look at the fact of Christ as a transparent medium through which Divine grace is shining. Therefore we are not to be dissuaded from contemplating that inexhaustible object, or from letting its whole significance tell upon our minds, by the premature introduction, say, of vetoes and interdicts which take their rise in a domain lying outside the historical revelation, as is surely the case when, as Dr. Forrest remarks, it is sought 'to disparage the idea of the Son's self-limitation by asking what became of His cosmical function during the incarnate period.'[1] This objection, I would add, may often on examination be found

[1] *Authority of Christ*, p. 95.

to imply a really tritheistic view of Godhead. The doctrine of the Trinity is indeed a comprehensive expression of the new Christian thought of God; but it is to be reached and controlled by that which we learn from the Incarnation, not assumed as dictating what the Incarnation has to teach us.

A quickened sense of these things has induced several living theologians to reopen the problem on Kenotic lines. It would be absurd to say that anything like a movement is on foot. But the coincidence of result is striking when we take a number of important works issued within the last ten or twelve years. The books of Principal Fairbairn and Dr. Forrest are so well known and so highly valued that I need not pause upon them, though it is worth noticing that Dr. Forrest's attitude to the Kenotic view is even more decisively that of championship in his *Authority of Christ* (1906) than in his *Christ of History and of Experience* (1897). Dr. Sanday, in a passing but suggestive phrase of his latest work, has said that 'the period of Christ's earthly ministry was really a period (so to speak) of *occultation*.'[1] In a valuable article on the Trinity, Bishop D'Arcy, after speaking of the subordinate character of the Son's Divinity as portrayed in the New Testament, proceeds: 'It is this derivative character which helps us to realize that the limitations to which He submitted during His life on earth involved no breach of His Divine identity. . . . His Divinity is dependent from moment to moment upon the Father; and therefore there is no difficulty in accepting what seems to be a necessary inference from the facts of the Gospel history, that, during our Lord's life on earth, there took place a limitation of the Divine effluence.'[2] Principal Garvie and Mr. W. L. Walker appear to be at one in regarding the temporal Kenosis, if we may so describe it, as the illustration and perfect manifestation of an eternal process of self-emptying in the nature of Godhead. Mr. Walker, arguing that the Cross is the symbol of the inmost being of Deity, insists on this timeless background of the earthly drama. 'The life of God,' he writes, 'is for ever the same life of self-denial and self-sacrifice, because it is the life of perfect Love. Out of His overflowing fulness He is constantly giving of Himself in creation in order to find Himself again in those whom He has raised to participation in the Divine life. This is that eternal *kenosis* in which "the Son" is for ever passing out of "the Father" and again returning to the bosom of God.'[3] From this point of view Dr. Garvie finds it possible to harmonize the higher being of Christ with His experience of temptation, as also to reach a more spiritual construction of His miracles. 'The miracles,' he contends, 'did not lessen the self-emptying of the incarnation,' inasmuch as there still prevailed ethical conditions under which alone the derived power could be exerted, namely, intense sympathy with man and absolute confidence in God.[4] Notwithstanding this, Dr. Garvie claims the right to criticize the older Kenotic theories, and does so with a good deal of severity; thereby putting tacitly in force the distinction to which I have already called attention, between a principle and the methods of its application. And, to come to our last example, Dr. Forsyth has just issued a volume, pulsing with warm and live thought, the concluding chapters of which are an exposition not so much of a speculative theory of how the Incarnation must have taken place, as rather of certain vital religious postulates forced upon those who hold firmly to the pre-existence of Christ. Guided by the Kenotic idea (in connexion, it is important to observe, with the thought of a gradual or progressive Incarnation), he there maintains that 'we face in Christ a Godhead self-reduced but real, whose infinite power took effect in self-humiliation,' supporting this by the argument that 'as God, the Son in His freedom would have a Kenotic power over Himself corresponding to the infinite power of self-determination which belongs to deity.' The difficulties of such a view, he holds, are more scientific than religious; but even so analogies are discoverable in man's nobler experience pointing to ways in which the attributes of God, without being wholly renounced, might be retracted into a different form of being, and from actual become potential. 'If the infinite God was so constituted that He could not live as finite man, then He was not infinite.'[5] And yet again, despite all this, Dr. Forsyth nowhere confounds the principle with specific examples of it, but feels quite at liberty to say that there is something presumptuous in certain Kenotic efforts to body forth just what

[1] *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 136.
[2] *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. ii. p. 762.
[3] *Gospel of Reconciliation*, p. 169.
[4] *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, p. 234.
[5] *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, Lecture XI.

the Son of God must have undergone in such an experience.

I have given these specimen passages—which it would not be difficult to multiply—in order to suggest that the idea they involve is to-day striving once more for expression. There are obvious differences between the older Kenotic theories and the new. A favourite charge against the older sort of construction was the charge of mythology. It was said to be like nothing so much as pagan stories of gods visiting the earth. The reproach was a natural one in the lips of those who repudiate the idea of Incarnation absolutely. If a man does not feel that in Christ we are confronted with the outcome of a vast Divine sacrifice—with what, from the human point of view, is nothing less than an ineffable event in Divine history—for him the problem which Thomasius and the rest were trying to solve (and, as a preliminary, to state) will scarcely exist. He cannot see what the discussion is about. But it is discouraging to find the criticism of more positive thinkers taking pretty much the same line. In their case the Divine immutability is frequently appealed to as an axiom which puts Kenotic ideas out of court from the first. Yet the argument from immutability, it is not too much to say, is a weapon we grasp by the blade. It is an argument with which Celsus and Strauss, to name no more, were quite familiar; they used it, however, as an axe which may be laid with deadly effect at the root of *all* Christian doctrine about God—His personal action, His providence, His saving advent in Christ as such. Therefore the late Dr. A. B. Bruce would have none of this objection. 'It appears to me,' he writes, 'not very safe to indulge in *a priori* reasonings from Divine attributes, and especially from Divine unchangeableness. It is wiser in those who believe in revelation to be ready to believe that God can do anything that is not incompatible with His moral nature.'[1] If Jesus is one in whom God Himself enters our life, plainly He does so either with all His attributes unmodified, or in such wise as to manifest only such attributes as are compatible with a genuinely human experience—putting as much of Himself into humanity as humanity will hold; and which of these alternatives we shall adopt is of course fixed for us by the historic record. To say, as is often said, that we cannot think away a single Divine property without destroying God is not merely a statement so abstract as to be irrelevant to the concrete matter before us; it is a principle which has only to be rigorously enforced to bar out the Incarnation itself.

Personally I find it difficult to understand how those can escape from some form of Kenotic theory who are really bent on having a Christology of some kind, and who, in addition, hold the following four positions, all of them, I think, bound up with the completely Christian view of Jesus. (1) Christ is now Divine; He is the object of faith and adoration, with whom we have immediate, though not unmediated, fellowship. (2) In some personal sense He was Divine eternally, since it is unthinkable that Godhead should have come to be; hence His pre-existent being is to be conceived as real, not ideal only. (3) His life on earth was genuinely human, moving always within the lines of an experience humanly normal in its nature, though abnormal in its quality (*e.g.* sinless). (4) There were not in Him two consciousnesses or two wills, but the unity of His personal life is fundamental. As the late Dr. Moberly has put it, 'Whatever the reverence of their motive may be, men do harm to consistency and truth, by keeping open as it were a sort of non-human sphere or aspect of the Incarnation. This opening we should unreservedly desire to close. There were not two existences either of, or within, the Incarnate, side by side with one another. If it is all Divine, it is all human too.'[2] When we think these four axiomatic positions together, it is extremely difficult, I repeat, to avoid the inference that some limitation of Godhead, real but unspeakably gracious, must have preceded the advent in our midst of Him who is Immanuel, God with us.

Later statements on the subject have this advantage, one feels, that they tend to approach the question by way of postulate *a parte post*, reaching after the Kenotic conception as that by which alone the historic Life can be interpreted consistently with its higher import, but not venturing, as some of the earlier theories ventured, to expatiate in the domain of speculation *a parte ante*, and to describe the steps by which Incarnation was actualized with a minuteness that too much resembled theosophy. We have been

[1] *Humiliation of Christ*, p. 171.

[2] *Atonement and Personality*, p. 97.

taught by Lotze that it is vain to ask 'how being is made.' We may not ascend up to construe things from the standpoint of Deity; for any construction of Christ's person in which the modern mind takes an interest must start from, and proceed through, the known facts of His human life. The known facts of His human life, I say advisedly; for as the discussion matures it becomes plain that the Kenotic view, be it right or wrong, does not in the least depend for its cogency upon one or two passages in St. Paul, even though one of these passages has happened to give a name to the theory as a whole. We have only to place together these two words of Jesus: 'I and the Father are one,' and 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, but the Father,' to have the problem full upon us. It is present, therefore, in the unchallenged facts of the New Testament, whether or no we theologize upon it. And even as regards subsequent Christological thinking, while no one in his senses would maintain that the Greek or Latin Fathers had begun to shape a Kenotic *theory*, yet there are substantial grounds for holding that writers like Ignatius, Irenæus, and Hilary did give expression intermittently to great religious *intuitions*, which, if consistently developed, and not immediately stifled, as in Hilary's case they were most noticeably, by counter-statements of a more correct orthodox pattern, would have resulted in something not very unlike the modern view. Whenever they shake off the haunting docetism that spoils much of their reflexion on the historic Christ, it is in this direction that many of their best inspirations tend.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

Revelation vii. 14.

'These are they which come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'—R.V.

It is told of Robert Burns that he could never read the closing verses of this chapter without tears. It is no wonder. The poet is a man of larger heart, of broader and keener sympathy than other men, and with a corresponding power of expression. But we all feel that in words like those of this text something in our hearts is met. They speak of possibilities in ourselves, possibilities of great joy, and they assure us that these possibilities may be realized, because they speak of yet greater possibilities in Christ. When the picture of a blissful world and its blessed inhabitants is unfolded, the imagination leaps forth to meet it; the heart is stirred, melted, satisfied with a conception so pure and beautiful, yet so real and human—the heaven of the redeemed lying as clear before us in the revelation of God, as the way of redemption that leads us to it.[1]

The subject is *The Great Tribulation and the Way Out.*

[1] See J. Laidlaw, *Studies in the Parables*, p. 271.

I. The Great Tribulation.

1. What is tribulation?

The original meaning of this word is full of interest. It is derived from the 'tribula' or 'tribulum' (τριβόλος). This corn-drag, or sledge, consisted of a thick heavy board, furnished beneath with pieces of iron and sharp flints. It was drawn over the corn by a yoke of oxen, the driver himself being upon it, or else a great weight, in order to separate the grain from the chaff and to cut the straw. The ultimate object of tribulation, literal or figurative, is the removal of the worthless and the purification and preservation of that which is valuable. The lesson of the threshing-floor, the flying chaff and garnered grain, is written large in the history of nations and individuals. It is not in the tropics, but amid the buffets and bruising of the northern climes that courage, sympathy, self-control—the best qualities of mind and soul—have been produced.

Darwin said to one of his friends, 'If I had not been so great an invalid, I should not have done nearly so much work.'

Carlyle observes, 'We will not complain of Dante's miseries; had all gone well with him as

he wished it, Florence would have had another prosperous Lord Mayor, but the world would have lost the *Divina Commedia*.'

Browning puts the matter thus:

'I can believe this dread machinery
Of sin and sorrow (would confound me else),
Devised . . . to evolve
By new machinery in counterpart,
The moral qualities in man—how else?—
To make him love and be beloved,
Creative and self-sacrificing, too,
And thus eventually God-like.'

When I was once on holiday in the south of France, says Dr. Whyte, going out to the harvest field, I saw the husbandman taking his sheaves and passing them through a kind of operation. I have never seen anything like it at home, and when I watched the process and tried in my broken language to converse with him, he said, 'Oh, this is an instrument which we have received from our forefathers, it has been in use for generations and centuries, and we call it tribulation, and we call this instrument the tribula. It has come down as our own habits of industry, and instruments of industry come down century after century entirely unchanged.' So this process of threshing, winnowing the wheat, separating the chaff from the wheat was called tribulation in the ancient days of the Roman Empire, and it has come down to this very day, and if you visit such places in Christendom you will hear the husbandman speak of passing his sheaves through great tribulation. The Holy Ghost borrows the word, and by the genius and scholarship and grace of His servants the Holy Ghost borrows such words, sanctifies them, separates them from common use, and brings them into the use and service of the Church of Christ.[1]

The history of the word 'tribulation' is very well told by Archbishop Trench in his book *On the Study of Words*, in which he quotes these lines from George Wither:

Till from the straw the flail the corn doth beat,
Until the chaff be purgèd from the wheat,
Yea, till the mill the grains in pieces tear,
The richness of the flour will scarce appear.
So, till men's persons great afflictions touch,
If worth be found, their worth is not so much,
Because, like wheat in straw, they have not yet
That value which in threshing they may get.[2]

2. *The* great tribulation. This passage is often quoted as an example of the injustice that has been done in the Authorized Version to the definite article. The Greek has the definite article here—'These are they which come out of the great tribulation'; or more literally, 'out of the tribulation, the great,' for the article is repeated, to make the adjective emphatic (ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης). The leaving out of the article, so emphatically repeated, says Trench, causes us to miss the connexion between this passage and Mt $24^{22.29}$, Dn 12^{1}. It is the character of the Apocalypse, the crowning book of the Canon, that it abounds with allusions to preceding Scriptures; and, numerous as are those that appear on the surface, those which lie a little below the surface are more numerous still. Thus there can be no doubt that allusion is here to 'the great tribulation' of the last days, the birth-pangs of the new creation, which our Lord in His prophecy from the Mount had foretold.[3]

St. John, an exile in Patmos, knew well how definite the tribulation was, and how great. They were in it as he wrote. Some of them were coming out of it daily, passing through death to glory. In some places there would scarcely be a house where there was not one dead.

Nor has the Church at any time missed its share in the great tribulation. 'The history of the Church,' says Paxton Hood, 'is the history of martyrdom. The churches are rich with memorials of martyrs. Bishop Hooper—brave Hooper—his crest was a limb burned in the flame. Luther's crest was a hand, and in the hand a cross. In the great French exhibition of 1867 I was struck with the painting "The Dying Christian," the picture of a beautiful woman, her hands bound with cruel cords, floating on unconsciously beneath the green waves, a halo round her head.'[4]

We have had our share of it in Scotland, says Dr. Whyte. The hills and valleys of Scotland could tell a great and glorious story of how God by His tribulations, the way He permitted men to persecute the Church of Christ, has purified the Church.[5]

3. But there are different kinds of tribulation. It may be the crushing on the wheel or the stake of fire; or it may be the patient, slow application of daily trials. It may be the act of some savage issuing in the death of a Chalmers or a Hannington; or it may be the mere wear and tear of common life, some crushing burden, some hidden struggle against temptation, some grinding care or sad bereavement; it may be some slight mis-

[1] Alexander Whyte, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxvii. p. 388.

[2] George Wither, quoted in Trench, *On the Study of Words*, p. 48.

[3] Trench, *On the Authorized Version*, p. 133.

[4] E. Paxton Hood, in *Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd ser. ii. p. 213.

[5] A. Whyte, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxvii. p. 388.

understanding or misrepresentation, or the weariness and painfulness of commonest details.[1]

Dr. Arnold thinks that the tribulations of modern life might be divided into two classes: (1) those we meet with from being obliged to run counter to the opinions and feelings of other men, and (2) those we become exposed to from the increased tenderness of our own consciousness. To these, however, must be added (3) the large class just referred to, the tribulation arising from the events of God's providence in our daily life. 'I had once,' says Dr. Whyte, 'a young communicant, a young gentleman in the congregation that used to be oftener on the Sabbath afternoon with a cigar in his mouth and a cane in his hand than at the worship of God. I was astonished when he came offering himself for a young communicant—I may not have been able to hide my astonishment when I put the question to him, what led him to think of this?—he gave me a very short answer. "Sir, I was engaged to be married, and she died." And he told me no more.'[2]

Eyes that the preacher's art in vain hath schooled,
By wayside graves are raised;
And lips cry, 'God be merciful,'
That ne'er said, 'God be praised.'

The *Gloriosa superba* is native to Southern India. During the autumn rains you find it shooting in the lane bordered thickly by huge cactus and aloe. Here and there you see it in the open field. In the field it will have a chance, you think; but in the lane, crowded down by cactus and aloe, great, strong, assertive things with most fierce thorn and spike, what can a poor lily do but give in and disappear? A few weeks afterwards you see a patch of colour on the field, you go and gather handfuls of lovely lilies, and you revel in the tangle of colour, a little bewilderment of delight. But the lane, go to the lane! There you see something far more satisfying, not only entangled colour, but all the grace of form, God's full thought grown to perfection. Eight feet up in the clear air, bright against the luminous blue, unfurling its fire-flowers like banners of triumph, there is the lily victorious. Each little delicate bud and leaf seems as if filled with a separate keen little joy, the joy of just being beautiful and free. The *Gloriosa* will exist in the field, just as it will exist in the English hothouse, because it must. But it is not happy there. There is no proper development. Give it life, not just existence. Give it something to conquer. Give it the thorn and the spike.[3]

II. The Way Out. The way out—for tribulation, however good its results, is not itself good, and no one desires its continuance. 'No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous.' There are two things to be taken account of in the way out: (1) the Means and (2) the Application.

1. The Means. The means, according to our text, is the blood of the Lamb. Now this is John's message. This is the central word of the text. This is the reason of all the writing. If we cannot make 'the blood of the Lamb' real, we miss all that the Apostle has to say to us.

We believe it is in order to make it real that the Rev. R. J. Campbell gives the following explanation of the blood of the Lamb: 'I went down to Brighton yesterday to pay the last tribute of respect to the earthly remains of a good man who was and is my friend. His death called forth many expressions of affection and reverence from those whom he had helped and blessed. I believe I am in possession of the secret of that life, and know what gave it power. Many years ago my friend passed through a period of doubt and darkness wherein he lost sight of the face of God. He came out of it by realizing that what took place at Calvary was the expression of what all life ought to be—love revealed in sacrifice. He said that that was the true revelation of the innermost of God, and that all human life must reach it too in order to attain its own highest. Henceforth, the watchword of his life was service. He lived to serve his kind, whether he felt like it or not, and without looking for recognition or reward. Even the word "duty" does not fully express what he sought to do. He went beyond duty in order to reach Christ; that is, he gave himself freely and without stint wherever and whenever he could serve a brother man and make the burden of life a little easier to bear. It cost him many a struggle and many a pang to be faithful to his ideal. Was not this the shedding of the blood of the Lamb?'[4]

That, we say, seems to be an attempt on the part of the preacher to realize St. John's expression and give it ethical value. But it is impossible to accept it as an interpretation. If that is the Apostle's meaning, his language is intolerably ill-chosen. If that is his meaning, the whole Book of Revelation is more utterly out of joint than ever was imagined.

There is a better explanation given by Dr.

[1] See T. T. Carter, *The Spirit of Watchfulness*, p. 252.
[2] Alexander Whyte, *ibid.* p. 388.
[3] Amy Wilson-Carmichael, *Overweights of Joy*, p. 291.
[4] See *Christian World Pulpit*, lxxiii. p. 99.

Monro Gibson in *The Expositor* (5th ser. vi. 218). What is the origin of the figure? It carries us back to the daily offering in the Temple of a lamb for the sin of the people. When the blood of the lamb was shed, the pious Israelite, taking the lamb as his representative, gave up the life which he lived in the flesh. He surrendered his life to God because it had become forfeit to God through sin. But in surrendering his life as forfeit he gave up also the sinfulness of his life. So when the blood of the lamb, representing the life of the lamb (for in their idea the life was in the blood), was taken by the priest and sprinkled upon the altar, the pious Israelite used the act to represent his own dedication of himself to serve God in righteousness.

This explanation preserves the figure, and at the same time preserves that ethical value which Mr. Campbell seems to look for. Christ is the Lamb of God, with whom the Christian is associated, in his death to sin and in his rising again to righteousness, by a far closer bond than was the pious Israelite to the sacrificial lamb. By faith in Christ, his representative in the likeness of sinful flesh, he dies to sin and rises to righteousness. And the impulse to righteousness is stronger than that which any resolution to do right can give a man.

And what does Mr. Campbell do with the conscience which feels the agony of guilt? What does he do with all the Scripture and all the history of mankind which says:

> Rock of ages, cleft for me,
> Let me hide myself in Thee?

Sir A. Conan Doyle, in his history of the Boer War, tells us how on one occasion a comparatively small detachment of the British army was surprised by a force of the enemy twice its strength. The British were driven back upon their camp, and the Boers occupied a commanding position from which they were enabled to pour volley after volley into the English lines. The British wounded in the earlier part of the action found themselves in a terrible position, laid out in the open under a withering fire. One of this number, a corporal in the Ceylon Mounted Infantry, tells the story himself: 'We must get a red flag up, or we shall be blown off the face of the earth.' He says, 'We had a pillow-case, but no red paint. Then we saw what would do instead; so they made the upright with my blood, and the horizontal with Paul's.' This grim flag, the blood-red cross upon the white background, was respected by the Boers. Those lying beneath it were safe. Even so—beneath the blood-stained cross of Christ we find our safe refuge.[1]

[1] Sir A. Conan Doyle, *The Great Boer War*, p. 411.

2. The Application. 'They washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'

1. They did this themselves. It is not a fictitious transaction. They did it by faith, by faith in the blood of the Lamb, and faith is an active, energetic, overcoming power.

2. But how can blood wash white? History says it was so. History tells us that the bloodiest crime that ever was committed has been the means of the greatest purity of life, the occasion of the very perfection of holiness. Not all blood washes white, says Dr. Matheson. There are struggles in which I conquer, but from which I yet come down with the shrunk sinew. But the blood of the Lamb makes me pure and leaves no stain behind. The cross of Christ leaves no print of the nails.

William Arnot, preaching in the open air one fine summer evening in Glasgow, on the words 'Who are these which are arrayed in white robes, and whence came they?' pointed to a fleecy cloud that was sailing across the blue sky. Whence came that white cloud? he asked, and reminded his hearers how it had been raised by the power of the sun's rays, not only from ocean and river and mountain lake, but from stagnant ponds and muddy pools as well,—from the back lanes and narrow streets of the crowded city,—raised, purified, transformed. So the Sun of Righteousness had power to sanctify men of every class and condition.

3. Who then will grudge the tribulation?

'When the shore is won at last,' sings Keble.

> When the shore is won at last,
> Who will grudge the billows past?

An old Highland boatman once rowing me through a somewhat stormy passage in the north, a godly old soul, to him I quoted this. I said:

> When the shore is won at last,
> Who will grudge the billows past?

He says, 'Sir, we have a proverb in Stornoway in the Lews like that. We say, "When we get salt at Stornoway we will not grudge the storm we meet on the way." When we come from the little islands to buy salt for the business, when we get the salt in the boat we do not grudge the storm.'[2]

And it has much present encouragement.

One night, during that terrible winter in the Crimean War, Duncan Matheson, the evangelist, was returning, weary and sad, from Sebastopol to his poor lodgings in the old stable at Balaklava. He had laboured all day with unflagging energy, and now his strength was gone. He was sickened

[2] Alexander Whyte, *ibid.* p. 388.

with the sights he had seen, and was depressed with the thought that the siege was no nearer an end than ever. As he trudged along in the mud knee-deep, he happened to look up and noticed the stars shining calmly in the clear sky. Instinctively his weary heart mounted heavenward in sweet thoughts of the 'rest that remaineth for the people of God,' and he began to sing aloud the well-known scriptural verses:

> How bright these glorious spirits shine!
> Whence all their white array?
> How came they to the blissful seats
> Of everlasting day?
>
> Lo! these are they from sufferings great,
> Who came to realms of light,
> And in the blood of Christ have washed
> Those robes which shine so bright.

Next day was wet and stormy, and when he went out to see what course to take, he came upon a soldier standing for shelter below the verandah of an old house. The poor fellow was in rags, and all that remained of shoes upon his feet were utterly insufficient to keep his naked toes from the mud. Altogether he looked miserable enough. The kind-hearted missionary spoke words of encouragement to the soldier, and gave him at the same time half a sovereign with which to purchase shoes, suggesting that he might be supplied by those who were burying the dead. The soldier offered his warmest thanks, and then said, 'I am not what I was yesterday. Last night, as I was thinking of our miserable condition, I grew tired of life, and said to myself, Here we are, not a bit nearer taking that place than when we sat down before it. I can bear this no longer, and may as well try and put an end to it. So I took my musket and went down yonder in a desperate state about eleven o'clock; but as I got round the point, I heard some person singing, "How bright these glorious spirits shine," and I remembered the old tune and the Sabbath School where we used to sing it. I felt ashamed of being so cowardly, and said, Here is some one as badly off as myself, and yet he is not giving in. I felt he had something to make him happy of which I was ignorant, and I began to hope I too might get the same happiness. I returned to my tent, and to-day I am resolved to seek the one thing.' 'Do you know who the singer was?' asked the missionary. 'No,' was the reply. 'Well,' said the other, 'it was I'; on which the tears rushed into the soldier's eyes, and he requested the Scripture-reader to take back the half-sovereign, saying, 'Never, sir, can I take it from you, after what you have been the means of doing for me.'[1]

Literature.

On Tribulation.—R. C. Trench, *On the Study of Words*, 47; D. Johnston, *Plea for a New English Version of the Scriptures*, 289; T. Arnold, *Christian Life*, 217.

On the Text.—W. Bright, *The Law of Faith*, 264; J. Laidlaw, *Studies in the Parables*, 271; A. K. H. Boyd, *Sermons and Stray Papers*, 139; T. T. Carter, *The Spirit of Watchfulness*, 247; G. Matheson, *Searchings in the Silence*, 77; J. Vaughan, *Sermons*, No. 1022; A. Butler, *Sermons*, 2nd ser. 78; *Christian World Pulpit*, viii. 300 (A. Mackennal), lxvii. 387 (A. Whyte), lxxiii. 97 (R. J. Campbell); *Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd ser. ii. 211 (E. Paxton Hood); *Expository Times*, ix. 3.

[1] J. Macpherson, *Life and Labours of Duncan Matheson*, p. 70.

Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

By the Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., Wimbledon.

2. Of a Good Degree.

οἱ γὰρ καλῶς διακονήσαντες βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιοῦνται (1 Ti 3[13]).

Among the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα of the Pastoral Epistles, one of the most interesting is the word βαθμός, which is translated 'degree' by the A.V. (following Wyclif), and 'standing' by R.V. The word is found nowhere else in the N.T. According to the Apostle a noble type of service in the diaconate secures a twofold reward—a stepping-place or vantage ground for further advance, and much boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus. Of these two resultant achievements we may leave the latter for subsequent treatment and turn our attention to the former.

Undoubtedly the rendering 'degree' is a literal translation of the Vulgate *gradus* ('bonum gradum sibi acquirent.') 'Gradus' is a word which suggests a host of associations—ecclesiastical (*e.g. graduale* or service-book of portions sung *in gradibus* or on the steps of the choir) and scholastic (cp. Low Latin *graduatus*, which gives us our 'graduate'). The 'degree' which marks a distinct stage in a

University career represents the Old French *degre*, *degret*, a 'step' or 'rank' (originally a step-down, as on a staircase). Murray (*Oxford Dictionary*, *s.v.*, *Degree*) quotes Wyclif's quaint saying, 'Degre takun in scole makith goddis word more acceptable, and the puple trowith betere thereto whanne it is seyd of a maistir'; and for the meaning of 'step' he cites an illustration from Hakluyt (vol. i. 69), 'There were certain degrees or staires to ascend vnto it'; and the more familiar words from Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar* (II. i. 26), 'He then vnto the Ladder turnes his Backe . . . scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend.'

The Greek *βαθμός* (which according to Phrynichus is an Ionic form for the Attic *βασμός*) is undoubtedly rendered quite correctly *gradus* in Latin, and 'degree' (=step) in English. It occurs in the LXX more than once, evidently with this meaning, *e.g.* 1 Sam. 5^5, of the 'threshold' of the house of Dagon; 2 Kings 20^9, of the 'ten steps' on the dial of Ahaz; and in Sir. 6^{36}, of the 'steps' of the door of the man of understanding ('if thou seest a man of understanding, get thee betimes unto him and let thy foot wear the *steps* of his door'). This meaning is also well attested by examples in such writers as Strabo, Lucian, Appian, and Artemidorus.

While we speak of a man of good *standing*, the Greeks, to represent the idea, used a word the etymology of which indicates movement and advance rather than rest and stationariness. If a deacon renders good service, his achievement instantly suggests further advance. But what kind of advance? It is certain that nothing can be further from the Apostle's thought than the idea of official promotion, or a rise in ecclesiastical office. That indeed may be the result of approved fitness; but to make it a motive of service is very far from his purpose, and quite alien to his ideal. Dr. Hort, in his *Christian Ecclesia* (p. 202), interprets the term as 'a vantage ground, a "standing" (R.V.), a little, as it were, above the common level, enabling them (the *διάκονοι*) to exercise an influence and moral authority to which their work, *as such*, could not entitle them.' Undoubtedly faithful service lifts a man above his fellows and puts him in a position for exercising a wider influence: and this is true of the humbler and less conspicuous services of the Church. 'He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much.' But while the rise to a position of increased spiritual influence is assuredly implied by the Apostle's phrase, it is not a throne or seat of honour or eminence of which he speaks: it is a *step*; and a step implies advance, not mere elevation. It would be well, therefore, not to exclude the personal equation from the statement. Noble service secures a new foothold for further progress on the ladder, whereby we ascend to God. Tennyson has spoken of rising 'on stepping-stones of our dead selves,' perhaps here following Augustine's words, which have been so nobly interpreted by Longfellow:

> Saint Augustine! well hast thou said,
> That of our vices we can frame
> A ladder, if we will but tread
> Beneath our feet each deed of shame![1]

That is a different side of experience. The Apostle hints that the noble performance of a lowly duty is really an ascent of the *scala perfectionis*. Quite apart from its influence on others, the deed of love is a means of spiritual ascent for ourselves. Every conquest over slothfulness, self-absorption, and 'accidie' is to be regarded not negatively, but positively, as equivalent to the putting on of new strength and courage for the toils of self-sacrifice. The more we discover the inherent divinity of the obscure life when spent on the highest aims, the more fully are we encouraged to go on with it, to give up no noble quest, to surrender no high ideal. Each step in the steep ascent of the spiritual life is won by the patience of love: and each stage is the promise of the next. The Christian does not think so much of 'the world's great altar-stairs' as sloping '*thro' darkness* up to God' (*In Memoriam*, lv.); but rather, if he follow the thought of the Apostle, of an ascent into ever-clearer light, ever-deepening vision, of a progress in which abounding love girds him with nobler might and invigorates him with increased strength of purpose.

To the Apostle, therefore, the Christian service is not primarily the securing of a stable influence, the resting with satisfaction on noble achievements, the possession of a throne from which we can quiescently contemplate the flux and cross-currents of human life. Good work done is not a means to rest, but to further progress. 'If,' he

[1] See the poem entitled *The Ladder of St. Augustine*, which the poet bases on the words taken from the Third Sermon *De Ascensione*, 'De vitiis nostris scalam nobis facimus, si vitia ipsa calcamus.'

exclaims, 'to live in the flesh,—if this is the fruit of my work, then what I shall choose I wot not.'. The fruit of his work is the prolongation of opportunity. 'To depart and to be with Christ' is only 'far better,' because it will allow his energies to have fuller scope. With all his underlying mysticism, the Apostle was more Greek than Latin in his estimate of the Christian life. It was not so much *rest* within the Infinite that attracted him, as *movement* within the Infinite. The Western and mediæval type of Christian thought was fascinated more by the idea of rest than of progress. Eternity with its serene Beatific vision, unclouded by the battles of Time and its unaccomplished aims—this was the reward which dazzled the eyes of Augustine, Scotus Erigena, Bernard, Aquinas, and Dante. 'To the mediæval thinker there was no great outlook upon time: no essential message of love was borne upon its stream save that very message which it had itself retarded and was still obscuring. The evil in the world must be fought against, but could never be exterminated; it would, in some inconceivable manner, be transfigured to God and to His saints, but would never be annihilated to itself.'[1] But to the Greek type of thought, with which the modern world is more and more proving itself to be in sympathy, the problem of evil is not hopeless; nor does the universe bear upon it the marks of irretrievable failure. Our quickened sense of knowledge and of mastery over the forces of nature carries with it the unquenchable vision of progress. Alike in the moral and social sphere, the Christian life, while inwardly a peace with God, is outwardly a war against forces which cannot be finally impregnable. Evil, cruelty, injustice, hatred, vice—against these 'we fight to win.'

[1] Wicksteed, *Religion of Time and Eternity*.

Through every grade and rank of Christian service, humble and unnoticed, conspicuous and public, there is to be seen the spirit of an unconquerable energy—unresting and unsatisfied, until the battle is won. There are moods of the soul when we cry:

> I do not ask to see
> The distant scene—one step enough for me.

But when the kindly Light has revealed the way and we have taken the 'step' firmly, let us move forward in the strength of what we have already attained, reckoning every advance in wisdom and love so much clear gain for that 'upward' calling wherewith we have been called by Christ, every fresh call to duty and service a 'degree' to be surmounted as the condition of our growth in the knowledge and grace of our Lord.

In the Study.

A Study in the Subconsciousness of St. Paul.

Did St. Paul know Jesus in the flesh? Professor Johannes Weiss has no doubt whatever that he did.

The volume by Professor Weiss on *Paul and Jesus* has been translated into English by the Rev. H. J. Chaytor, M.A., Headmaster of Plymouth College. It belongs to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought' (2s. 6d. net each), a series which is making rapid progress. Three volumes have been issued together this month, the other two being *Revelation and Inspiration* by Professor Seeberg, and *Christianity and the New Idealism* by Professor Eucken. We shall probably have to return to Seeberg, certainly to Eucken, the great philosophical force of the future, from whom we have another volume translated this month, *The Meaning and Value of Life* (A. & C. Black; 3s. 6d. net), both books being turned into English by the same translators, Lucy Judge Gibson and W. R. Boyce Gibson. But for the present let us remain for a little with Weiss.

Professor Weiss has no doubt whatever that St. Paul had seen Jesus in the flesh. And he thinks he knows when he had seen Him. It was during His last visit to Jerusalem. He thinks it probable that he was a witness of Christ's Passion and Crucifixion. For if he was in Jerusalem at the time it is not likely that he would omit that, being so passionately enthusiastic a pupil of the Pharisees.

Then, if St. Paul witnessed the Passion and

Crucifixion, Professor Weiss can understand his 'entirely enigmatical behaviour' after his conversion. He 'retired to Damascus.' Now, says Professor Weiss, it is contrary to all historical and psychological experience that Paul should have retired to Damascus and solitude, instead of seeking information concerning Jesus, if he had possessed no knowledge of Jesus before his conversion. But if he had seen Jesus and had already learned the facts of His outward personality, there was no need to go to Peter or any other Apostle for enlightenment. The one question before him now was the nature of his future relations to Jesus, and the manner in which his knowledge of the man Jesus could be reconciled to the heavenly vision and his Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. What was before him was the task of constructing his gospel message, so that the facts which belonged to the life on earth and the facts which belonged to the life in glory might fall together and be the power of God unto salvation.

More than that, if St. Paul was present at the Passion and Crucifixion, Professor Weiss can then understand the conversion itself. He says that without the assumption that what St. Paul saw and heard of Jesus had made a strong impression upon him, any psychological explanation of St. Paul's vision is impossible. What he saw and heard *had* made a strong impression upon him, stronger, indeed, than he himself had realized or was afterwards willing to admit. 'No one,' says Professor Weiss, 'will deny that it is psychologically possible for an impression to persist below the threshold of consciousness, and imperceptibly to penetrate and modify the whole of a man's inward life. We should be depreciating both the personality of Jesus and the receptivity of Paul, if we refused to admit that the form and the words of the long-suffering One, His intellectual supremacy and constancy, His confidence and truth, His sympathy and earnestness, were able to produce that indelible impression even upon the hostile and refractory mind of the Pharisee.'

A Study in Evolution.

At the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association this year, Dr. F. E. Weiss, Professor of Botany in the University of Manchester, delivered a lecture on *The Bearings of the Darwinian Theory of Evolution on Moral and Religious Progress*. The lecture is published by Mr. Philip Green (1s. net).

We must not expect too much from Dr. Weiss. His lecture would take only an hour in delivery, and within that space he gives some account of four things—Darwinism, Evolution, Morality, and Religion. But we may expect that what is said will be said representatively. We may count upon it that what Dr. Weiss says would be said by the great body of scientific workers of our day. And then we may also expect that whatever is said about morals or religion will be said both frankly and reverently. For this is the great change that has come over the conflict between Science and Religion. We are not sure that the issue is less vital or the battle less hot. But we shall never again return to the barbaric methods of a Burgon or a Tyndall.

Well, Dr. Weiss admits that nothing could be more subversive of morality than the struggle for existence, with the survival of the fittest. And the struggle for existence, with the survival of the fittest, is Darwinism. But Darwin himself discovered that his great discovery had not unlimited application. The survival of the fittest is an excellent theory to account for the progress of the individual. But if nothing else interfered, only one individual would be left at last to make progress. Darwin found two things interfering with the ambitious selfishness of the individual, and working in the interest of the race. The first was the instinct of the mother to deny herself for the sake of her offspring; and the second was the tendency among certain animals to live in flocks or herds. The instinct of the mother develops into parental love, 'one of the most beautiful of human virtues.' The gregarious instinct develops into comradeship and communion.

Is there anything offensive in that? If we are moral, does it greatly matter where our morality came from? Darwin did not say that we are no more ethical than the lower animals. He said that with the advent of man there entered a wholly new and highly momentous element into the sphere of morality. That element is man's ability to reason. And after Darwin, all the evolutionary moralists—Hobhouse, Westermarck, Weiss—recognize a distinction between the moral actions of man and the non-moral impulses of animals. The distinction is that man has the

power of framing general conceptions and formulating rules of conduct.

These rules are at first of limited application. They are tribal or 'imperial.' And the examples held up for imitation are at first examples of patriotism—narrower or wider as the chance of birth or the fortune of war may direct. But even Darwin looked forward to the time when patriotism should pass into brotherhood. In the *Descent of Man*, he says: 'As man advances in civilization, and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to men of all nations and races.' 'Where there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free'—these are not Darwin's words, but that is his meaning.

Evolution has also touched religion. Dr. Weiss remembers that there is no realm of thought in which the theory of evolution has met with greater opposition than in theology. But it has done theology good. It has stimulated theological research and inquiry. It has called for a closer and more critical study of the Bible. And, above all, it has opened the way to that new discipline which is called Comparative Religion.

This is all gain—fathomless, limitless gain. Nor is there any countervailing loss. For the evolutionist has never suggested that he could trace the origin of religion to an animal instinct. Where he finds the dimmest flickerings of religious light, the evolutionist always finds a thinking individual. And all that he can affirm about the origin of religion is that it is already *in* man. Says Dr. Weiss: 'As we find practically some form of belief in the supernatural in all savage races, we may presume that it springs from a common necessity of all thinking individuals to speculate about their person and their surroundings and about life and the hereafter.'

It may seem that there is not much room left here for revelation. But where did this 'common necessity' come from? If we claim that it must have come from God, Dr. Weiss has not a word to say against that. He has not a word to say against it if we go on to declare that God who planted the common necessity pledged Himself by the planting of it to satisfy its desires.

It is usually held that the one keen controversy between Christianity and evolution is whether Christianity is an ascent from animism, or animism a descent from Christianity. But is that a serious issue? Is the Old Testament committed to it? Is the theology of St. Paul committed?

A Study in the Faith of Jesus.

In the October number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Principal Forsyth expressed his surprise that so little has been written about the faith of Jesus. 'A year or two ago,' he said, 'I remember searching such writers as I could reach who might be expected to handle the point, but without success.' This was the beginning of an article on 'The Faith of Jesus,' by Dr. Forsyth himself. And now this month, in a volume on *Jesus according to St. Mark*, written by the Rev. J. M. Thompson, Fellow and Dean of Divinity of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford, and published by Messrs. Methuen (5s. net), we come upon a section on the Faith of Jesus.

The section on the Faith of Jesus is part of a chapter on Jesus' Religion. Mr. Thompson says that the religion of Jesus was directed by the conditions of His early life. As a Jew He worshipped one God. He had a Jew's zeal for holiness. He shared in a Jewish patriotism. As a Galilæan He was brought up in the provincial simplicity and piety for which the Lake-country was so remarkable. As a carpenter of Nazareth He inherited an active working faith; one that faced the hard facts and cramping circumstances of life.

But Jesus' Churchmanship—the word is Mr. Thompson's, but he apologizes for it with inverted commas—Jesus' Churchmanship was not that of His contemporaries and nothing more. If the Galilæans disliked the formalism and official pretensions of the religious sects, Jesus made distrust of formalism a ruling principle of His religion. While He attended the village synagogue every Sabbath day, He was a convinced Nonconformist with regard to some of the commonest practices of religion. While He shared the general reverence for Jerusalem with its temples and its festivals, He could never think of it without a foreboding of its fall. His religious outlook went beyond Galilee and Jerusalem, but it rested upon the religious needs of fishermen and carpenters,

upon the unlovely lovable lives of publicans and sinners. And when the Baptist's preaching came, all this raw material of religion was fused into a white-hot love of God and man.

What forms did the religion of Jesus take? What were the momentous things in His religious principles and practice? Humility and faith, says Mr. Thompson, pre-eminently these two.

His humility was based on a sense of the reality of sin. For to be humbled by sin, says Mr. Thompson, one need not have sinned. It is enough if one has been tempted to sin. To be tempted is to have seen sin face to face and to find oneself, apart from God, powerless.

How did His humility find expression? It found expression, says Mr. Thompson, in the want of expression. This he takes to be a great personal characteristic of Jesus that He shrank from self-expression in personal affairs. He chose no more than twelve to whom to communicate the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. He excluded all but three from the scenes of His most important miracles, from His moments of ecstasy or from His prayers. Even the privileged three must pray apart at last, when the supreme temptation came upon Him in the Garden of Gethsemane. Jesus had His religious experiences, and they could not be hid. But He did not care to talk about them. The story of the baptism and temptation is the only part of the gospel which seems to be told by Himself.

The other element in the life of Jesus that most definitely determined His religion was His faith.

The faith of Jesus, says Mr. Thompson, was first of all an entire *trust*, trust in God's presence with Him, and care for Him. It was by faith that He disregarded physical dangers or the fear of death. It is recorded that once He slept peacefully in a small boat during a severe storm. Did He sleep because He was weary? The disciples were weary also. But they toiled in rowing, for they thought their rescue from death depended on it. Jesus slept because He had faith in God; and when He awoke He rebuked the disciples for want of it.

Mr. Thompson does not suggest that Jesus deliberately neglected the ordinary precautions that are necessary in order to sustain life. When a journey had to be undertaken the disciples usually provided food for it. Yet on one occasion, when they had neglected so to do, and Jesus made some reference to the leaven of the Pharisees, He was astonished when they suggested that He was thinking of their neglect. It was to Him as impossible that He should starve as that He should drown. And when He sent forth His Apostles to preach, He sent them with no provision for their journey, as if He would compel them to exercise that faith in which He Himself habitually lived.

The next thing is that the faith of Jesus was His *power*. It was through faith that He worked miracles. When the disciples confessed that they could not cast out an evil spirit, He called them a faithless generation. All things, He said, are possible to him that believeth. And if it is objected that such an attitude can only lead to disillusionment, the answer is that, in Jesus' case at least, it never did.

The third thing is that the faith of Jesus was faith in the *purpose* of God concerning Him. Here is at once the simplicity and the majesty of it. How could He drown or starve? God was keeping Him for a special work. God was designing His life and death in view of a great future end. And so, when death came, it was a voluntary death. It could not be otherwise than voluntary. It was the crucial experiment designed by faith to solve the mystery of His existence.

A Study in the Synoptic Problem.

There are some things about the Synoptic problem that are settled. One thing is the priority of the Second Gospel, and the use of it in the First and Third Gospels. But there are some things that are not yet settled. Of these the most keenly contested is the relation of the First Gospel to the Third. And of that circle of controversy the very centre is the question how it comes to pass that these two Gospels differ as they do, when it is evident that they are relying on the same document. The Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge believes that the difference may be due to translation.

Professor Stanton has published the second volume of his book on *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net). The first volume gave a history of the Canonical Gospels, described the use of them by the Church in the earliest days, and told what had

been said about them, and in what estimation they had been held. In the second volume Professor Stanton examines the Gospels themselves. Not the Fourth Gospel, however. This volume is wholly occupied with the Synoptists.

Now, in examining the Gospels themselves, Professor Stanton has not gone very far when he reaches the Sermon on the Mount. And he has not gone very far into the Sermon on the Mount when he reaches the Beatitudes. And when he reaches the Beatitudes, the first difficulty that stares him in the face is how to account for the difference between the Beatitudes in St. Matthew and the Beatitudes in St. Luke.

The differences are obvious to everybody. For while St. Matthew says, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit,' St. Luke says simply, 'Blessed are ye poor'; and then St. Luke adds, 'Woe unto you that are rich.' There are no 'Woes' in the First Gospel. What is the explanation of the difference?

Professor Stanton thinks that the differences may be due to translation. He thinks we have here different Greek translations of the same Aramaic original.

For the agreement in substance is close. It is in expression that the difference is wide. The difference in expression is distinctly greater than it is in the case of the Parable of the Vineyard, or of the Sower and its interpretation. It is true that there is a still greater difference in expression between Mt 24 and Lk 21, the great eschatological Discourse. But the difference there is due to the number of distinct sayings which have been added or substituted by St. Luke. In any case, the difference between the Beatitudes of St. Matthew and the Beatitudes and Woes of St. Luke 'reaches, if it does not even go beyond, the extreme limit that can be allowed for where the same Greek document was employed.' Consequently Professor Stanton suggests that the two Evangelists used different translations.

But if they used two different translations, the difficulty now is to account for the similarities. The words are very often the same, and very often they are remarkable words. Let any one who desires to see how two competent translators will vary in expression, look at the terrible passage from Nietzsche, which is quoted according to two different translators in the present number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Professor Stanton accounts for the similarities by pointing out that the two translators of the Gospel document would not be in the full sense independent. They would be sharers in the same special vocabulary and associations. Certain expressions would be fixed in their mind through oral tradition. And if all that is not sufficient, why, then, Professor Stanton offers the suggestion that the second translator may have had the first translation beside him as well as the original document.

Virginibus Puerisque.

THE KEY-FLOWER.

Some time ago we expressed our surprise that the Rev. John A. Hamilton had turned aside to other things after making manifest that his special gift (and how priceless a gift it is) was preaching to children. He has returned. The new volume is *The Wonderful River, and other Addresses to Children* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.). Let us notice the book by simply quoting one of the addresses. And let it be, not the address on a Drop of Water, or the Hermit Crab, or the Eye, or any other of the scientific addresses. Let it be one of the folk-lore addresses. Let it be the address on the Key-Flower.

But, first of all, let us remark that Mr. Allenson has also published a volume of Original Prose and Poetry suitable for Home Reading or for Social Meetings, written by Mary Knowles Jarvis, and called *Rest Awhile Stories* (1s. 6d. net); and a new volume of sermons by the Rev. John Thomas, M.A., of Liverpool, called *The Dynamic of the Cross* (3s. 6d. net).

There is an old story which used to be told by our far-off fore-mothers to their children, that runs like this:—One day when a girl had rambled into the forest, she met a lady, tall and stately, on whose beautiful face there was the kindest smile, and she spoke to the girl in a voice which made her think of the sound of the wind among the fir-trees, and of the mingled laughter and sobbing of the brook, as it leaps and runs down the mountain side, and of the song with which her mother lulled the little ones to sleep at night. The lady invited the girl to go with her deeper into the forest, and took hold of her hand to lead and uphold her along the dim forest ways.

The girl did not feel in the least afraid, but went willingly whither the lady led, until they came to a rocky wall covered almost with a curtain of hanging and creeping plants in full flowering. She lifted the flowery curtain aside a little and showed the girl a door which had been hidden by it, a door closed and locked. She gave the girl a primrose, and bade her touch the key-hole of the door gently with the flower,

and when she obeyed, the lock turned and the door opened, and the girl saw inside the cave a chest on which lay a pile of primroses.

'Go in,' said the lady, 'and remove the flowers from the chest, when you will see that below them there are heaps of gold and precious stones. Fill your apron with the treasure and carry it home, but before you leave the cave, put back the flowers as you found them; or a black dog will come out of the darkness and follow you all the days of your life.' The girl did as she was told, and when she had filled her apron and put back the flowers, the lady was gone; and as the girl stepped out into the open, the door closed and the lock snapped fast again. The girl carried the treasure home to her mother, and there was never any want of food or clothing in the cottage; they had abundance even in the hard winter-time.

What does the story mean? I am not quite sure about that. There is no doubt the lady is Bertha, of whom our fore-fathers and fore-mothers believed that she made the corn and the grass grow. She held the same place as a goddess with them as Ceres held among the Romans, and the story may mean that in the spring-time Bertha gives to the earth a key, by which the hidden treasures of the soil, the roots, and seeds, long locked by the frost, are opened to mankind, who are enriched thereby. That seems the likeliest meaning of the story; and if it *is* the meaning, we see that our fore-fathers, who had not the knowledge of God which we enjoy, yet had their grateful and graceful thoughts of the Being who, as they imagined, 'gave them rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness.' That is a pleasant and beautiful thought.

There will be no harm in our putting another meaning into the story, if we remember that it is not the first and original meaning. We may use it to remind ourselves that some things as tender and delicate as a primrose have the magical quality of opening locked doors behind which treasure is hidden. Humility is such a thing; it is a key-flower. You may meet one day with a gentleman who despises people 'that bother with weeds,' though the number of such gentlemen is fast diminishing, happily. But to those who were humble enough to notice wild plants we owe the fruits, roots, stalks, seeds which we eat as vegetables or dessert. And to such people we owe also the chief medicines which soothe our pains and heal our diseases. To the humble persons who have taken pains to mark the doings and productions of insects we are indebted for our ink, for many dyes, for wax and honey, and silk, as well as for the knowledge of means to protect ourselves and our property from injury and ruin.

A thousand comforts and enjoyments, to which we are now so much accustomed that we scarcely think of them, have been gained for us by men and women who looked attentively at grasses, and wild herbs, and toadstools, and galls, and caterpillars, and beetles. A wise man has warned us

> 'that he who feels contempt
> For any living thing, hath faculties
> Which he has never used;
> That thought with him
> Is in its infancy.'

Whatever God has thought fit to make deserves our notice, and there are great treasures still hidden, which will be unlocked only by the key-flower of humility. If you recall the stories which you have heard and read of famous discoverers, you will perceive that their discoveries were chiefly made by giving their minds to the observation of common, humble things which other folk thought beneath their notice.

There is another key-flower which is as much like humility as the primrose is like the cowslip, and that is kindness, which has a magical power in the opening of hearts, which have been long locked and barred. You may have a schoolfellow who is sullen and rough-mannered, and you are inclined to be as short and sulky with him as he is with you. But try the key-flower. It may be that it has never been applied to him. He may come from a very unhomely home; it may be that the locked door has been thumped on with a stone, which has the effect of jamming the lock tighter and tighter. It won't do any harm to try the key-flower, and it may have a wonderful result. There are boys and girls, and men and women too, who have fine qualities under a rough outside.

Let me tell you a little story. A half-withered cactus in a pot lay in a corner of a garden, and a visitor asked the owner of the garden why it lay there. 'It is no good,' was the answer; 'it never flowered.' The visitor thought it might not have had a fair chance, and he asked, 'Did you ever give it warm water?' In the end the owner was persuaded to let the plant stand in a window, and to water it with slightly warm water, whereupon the cactus revived and put out a wealth of splendid flowers. All it had needed was rather more kindly treatment. And it is just so with a good many human beings. Was not that one of the secrets of Jesus? He touched hearts with the key-flower of kindness, and people, who had seemed hard and bad, became better and gentler as He spoke to them, and outcasts and despised persons were made apostles and saints.

There is a name you know very well, that of John Williams, the missionary and martyr. Do you know that he was what some people called a 'bad boy,' until he went to Sunday school and met with a kind and patient teacher? What a store of treasure was opened when the key-flower of kindness touched his heart.

The Book with the Seven Seals.

AN ESSAY IN INTERPRETATION.

By the Rev. Andrew N. Bogle, M.A., Leith.

The Book of Revelation to the minds of many people is like a great city in a fog. Here and there the outline of some majestic building shows itself. It appears for a moment and then wavers out of sight. This book irritates the matter-of-fact mind which likes a clear and definite presentment of truth. The imagery is foreign and intolerable. The total effect is that of a confused medley of thrones, angels, horses, beasts, crowns, books, seals, and voices. It seems one vast tumultuous discord.

Now and then, however, notes of most limpid clearness are struck, which chime in sweet consonance with the everlasting song of salvation. These have preserved the book in the affection and reverence of Christians. Many can and do dispense with the visions. But there are passages in Revelation in which none who love the Saviour can fail to rejoice.

There is one of these in the fifth chapter: 'And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' No one can read this without a thrill. The worthiness of Jesus because of His death, because of the redemption of men to God by His blood, because of the universality of His kingdom, is a fit theme for a new song. But why does the writer say worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof? To many this adds nothing to what is said, but introduces the element of confusion which clings to an unfamiliar imagery. What book is this that the Lamb is worthy to open?

In the fourth chapter John begins the main theme of his Apocalypse by a description of heaven. The central figure in the scene is that of Him who sits upon the throne—the eternal Creator—for whose pleasure all things are and were created (v.[11]). In his right hand is this book. There is no man, however, worthy to open it; and the seer goes on to say, 'I wept much because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon.'

John had felt the weight of the problem that arises when we think of God as Creator and of the unsatisfactory nature of men's lives. His method of stating the old question as to how anything so imperfect as man's life can be found in a world created by God, is to represent in the hands of the Creator a book which no man can open. In this book lies the secret of life's enigma, the torture of which man can feel but which he cannot solve. One, however, has solved it—'The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.' The enigma of life has been solved by Jesus Christ. This is the main and central thought of Revelation.

The way in which this thought is worked out is extremely interesting. The starting-point is found in the seven seals by which the book of human destiny is sealed. In chapter six we have the account of the breaking of the first six seals. In this John gives us his philosophy of history, and his view of all the attempts men have made to understand their own destiny and work it out to a successful issue. As each of these attempts failed, another seal was set upon the book.

In connexion with the breaking of the first four seals a new illustration is introduced, namely, that of horses. There can be no doubt that by these horses John means to represent ideas that have ruled men's minds. What is there so swift and so strong as an idea?

Now there is one idea that has always exercised a deep influence on men's minds, and in which many have thought to find a solution of life's perplexities. It is the imperial idea—the thought of a great world empire by which all nations shall be united into one, bound together by a common religion, a common trade, and a common centre of government. Alexander the Great, inspired by this idea, had conquered the whole known world, and used all the resources of his power to consolidate his empire under the influence of the Greek spirit. After him came the Romans with a wider dominion and a more lasting power. Imagine the thoughts of men who believed in and worked for such an

empire. Here at last is the solution of life's problem. War, poverty, lawlessness, crime, all will disappear. Universal prosperity and peace are bound to reign. The golden age will dawn upon the world at last. With the breaking of the first seal, 'Behold, a white horse, and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer.' There is a picture of the imperial idea.

What is the result? Instead of peace, war. Instead of unity, separation. The empire established by the sword perishes by the sword inevitably and infallibly. 'All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.' It is the word of the ruler of history, and has been proved true again and again. So, with the breaking of the second seal, there goes forth one to whom power is given to take peace from the earth. The imperial idea gives no solution. Its negation is equally discouraging. Thus history places two seals on the book of man's destiny.

There is another idea which has always exercised a deep influence on men's minds. It is that of trade and industry. The true solution of life lies in a pair of balances, abundance of wheat, and barley, and oil, and wine. This is the idea of the political economist who thinks that the problem of life is to be solved, and the woe of the world banished, by material prosperity. With the breaking of the third seal, there goes forth a black horse: 'And he that sat on him had a pair of balances in his hand. And I heard a voice in the midst of the four beasts say, A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny; and see thou waste not the oil and the wine.' What is the result? What follows prosperity? What happens when a nation becomes wealthy? Luxury takes the place of toil and industry. Moral fibre becomes relaxed and unstrung. So, with the breaking of the fourth seal, Death is sent forth, and Hell followed with him. This is the fact that mocks the materialistic idea of the political economist. 'Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates, and men decay.' Moreover, death always awaits the individual. Though comforts are increased, the years draw nigh when man says I have no pleasure in them.

The materialistic idea of the political economist gives no solution. It is negatived by death, as well as by the decay which luxury brings. Nor are death and decay in the least helpful to a solution. Thus, again, history places two more seals on the book of human destiny.

There is, however, another idea which has influenced the minds of men, and another hope that has always been cherished. It is the idea of a new world through the testimony of those who are faithful to the word of God. In connexion with this John does not use the symbol of a horse. We can see why. There is nothing triumphant and sweeping about the progress of this idea. It has held a place in history beside those of empire and of industry, but in comparison with them it is secret and unobtrusive. It has never ruled as they have. It is not of this world, though in it. Those who have been faithful to it have been slain. The world has rejected them and the word in which they believed. With the breaking of the fifth seal, John 'saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?' The fate of the saints is, indeed, another seal on the book of man's destiny. 'Help, Lord; for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fall from among the children of men.'

There is, however, still another idea that men have cherished. It is that of the pessimist—Vanity of vanities, all is vanity. There is no issue to man's activity but the destruction of himself and all his works.

With the breaking of the sixth seal, John saw this awful destruction, 'When the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?' Wrath and destruction! Are these the end? The thought that they are, is another seal upon the book of man's destiny. But wrath and destruction are not the climax of John's vision. There is another seal, and with its breaking a new ray of light steals into the vision which culminates in that great picture of a new heaven and a new earth in the midst of which is God upon the throne, saying, 'Behold, I make all things new.'

We see thus that John was no hysterical visionary with an unrestrained imagination. He was a clear, far-sighted thinker who understood the great ruling thoughts of the world of mind, and who had come to the conclusion that by none of them could the mystery of human life be made plain. No man was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. His message, however, is not one of despair as is that of so many of the poets and philosophers of the old world. He comes to us with no tale about an inevitable fate to the decrees of which all must bow. Nor does he teach that men should seize the day and its immediate pleasure because none can be sure of anything beyond. He does not despair in the presence of all the suffering and sorrow of human life. He teaches, rather, that in all the confused tangle of the threads that make up life, a perfect pattern is being woven, and that the key to this pattern is to be found in Jesus Christ who died upon the cross. The Lamb that was slain is worthy to open the book, and into His hands it has been given.

Literature.

PLUMMER'S ST. MATTHEW.

Dr. Alfred Plummer, the editor of *St. Luke* in the 'International Critical Commentary,' has published *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Elliot Stock; 12s.). There is already a commentary in the 'International Critical' series by Mr. W. C. Allen. Dr. Plummer has written his book as a sequel to that commentary. On the one hand, he wishes deliberately to call attention to Mr. Allen's Commentary, which, he says, has been pronounced by the Central Society of Sacred Study to be 'the best English commentary on the First Gospel.' On the other hand, he desires to supplement Mr. Allen's Commentary, dealing more thoroughly with the historical, theological, and religious sides of the subject.

The Commentary on St. Matthew is to all intents and purposes a counterpart of the Commentary on St. Luke. The Greek text of the Gospel is not so much in evidence, it is true, being for the most part carefully confined to the smaller type. But there is the same accurate interest in the Greek; there is the same sense of the impossibility of building up a true exegesis on any English version whatsoever. The consequence is that while the paragraphs are quite intelligible to the reader of English, it is only the student of Greek who will understand the work that has been thrown into them.

The commentary follows the usual English methods. That is to say, it has an introduction in which are discussed the author, the sources, the plan, the Christology, and the date of the Gospel And there is added a most timely and useful section on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in relation to the First Gospel. Then follows the commentary. And the book ends with indexes of subjects and Greek words.

It is a rich book. It is full of matter that is most pertinent to its purpose, which is the interpretation of the First Gospel to the modern mind. Henceforth Plummer on St. Matthew is likely to be consulted as often as Plummer on St. Luke, and that is very often indeed. In all questions of interpretation we shall always turn to it, and we shall often turn to it first of all.

The printing has been done by Messrs. Morrison & Gibb of Edinburgh, and that is to say that better printing cannot be. The black sombre binding we do not care quite so much for.

DR. OSWALD DYKES.

A year or two ago four articles were published in succession in The Expository Times on the Person of Christ. It is a subject upon which both articles and books are published every month. But we have seen it stated that these four articles break away from modern literature on the subject of the Person of Christ, surpassing all else in insight. We have seen it stated that with them, short as they are, a new era opens in the interpretation of that doctrine which is fundamental for Christian faith.

Soon after the publication of these articles, Dr. Oswald Dykes was appointed Cunningham

Lecturer in the New College, Edinburgh. He took for his subject *The Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*. After delivering the Lectures, he revised them, arranged them in chapters, and published them under that title (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net). They form the twenty-first series of Cunningham Lectures, and a volume that is as handsome as it is convenient to handle.

'To re-shape the traditional doctrine of Creation and Providence under the light cast upon both Nature and History since last century opened fresh avenues for study in the ways of God, is, I think, one of the tasks at present laid upon theology.'

It is not only one of the tasks at present laid upon theology. It is the most urgent task. But it is not so much Creation as Providence that forces the task upon us. Darwinism, it is true, presented the alternative Creation or Evolution fifty years ago. But the existence of Christianity was never really in peril throughout all the discussion that ensued, because the issue never affected the common people. The doctrine of Providence affects the common people intimately. For a good many years those who have been disinherited of their right to live comfortably, and even cleanly, have been told that they are not bound to acquiesce in their inheritance; and now they reply to those who say to them that it belongs to the providence of God, that they will then have no more to do with a God of such providence. The existence of evil, and in particular the existence of the evil tyrant, is an ancient stumbling-block. What is modern is the determination on the part of the people to remove it.

Dr. Dykes deals with the doctrine of Creation and the doctrine of Providence. Creation is coming, and he warns us to be ready; but, Providence is on us. Now the surprise of his book is not the boldness with which he accepts the facts. He accepts the facts whether he can account for them or not. But we must all do that. The surprise is the originality and enterprise of his management of them. There is a chapter towards the end of the book on 'The Pangs of Nature.' It contains the writing of a theologian who is also a Seer. 'Finally,' says Dr. Dykes, 'the most singular contribution which Christian revelation has made to this mystery lies, I think, in its frank admission that the existing creation is only a temporary and imperfect stage in the Divine plan, with its hopeful outlook towards a higher development to follow.' The chapter must be read. Here it is enough to say that for such a faith, Dr. Dykes does not rely upon the evidence of science. And yet science has its suggestion to make. It assures us that 'in the history of the world there have already been two main epochs. During the first, matter was everything. It was a world of mechanism, moved by necessary law, where no sign was given that life or mind or spirit was ever to be joined to dead matter. Then came the long period when conscious mind has been embodied in the material, embodied for ages in the slow evolution of the animal, but now finding its culmination in the embodied Spirit of Man.' Near the close of that period Dr. Dykes thinks we may now be standing. 'Why,' he asks, 'should not a third and final era of development slowly dawn, or, it may be, with suddenness burst upon man and upon man's earth, when spirit shall not be disembodied but regnant, matter itself becoming so transformed at last as to be the obedient organ or handmaid of the spirit?'

NIETZSCHE.

Mr. T. N. Foulis, of 15 Frederick Street, Edinburgh, has undertaken to publish an edition of the works of Friedrich Nietzsche in eighteen volumes. It is described as the first complete and authorized English translation. The general editor is Dr. Oscar Levy. The first four volumes were published together last June; the second four have been issued now. They are (1) *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, which is translated by Thomas Common, and has an Introduction by Mrs. Förster-Nietzsche, and an Appendix of Notes by Anthony M. Ludovici (6s. net). (2) *The Future of our Educational Institutions*, with which is bound up the address on Homer and classical philology. This volume is translated by J. M. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy writes a very short introduction (2s. 6d. net). (3) *Human, All Too Human*, Part I., translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by J. M. Kennedy (5s. net). (4) *The Will to Power*, Vol. I., containing Books I. and II., translated by Anthony M. Ludovici (2s. 6d. net).

The first thing to observe about this edition of Nietzsche is its general attractiveness. The volumes are a delight to handle. The next thing is its cheapness. Clearly the publishers are counting upon an audience for Nietzsche in this country.

They tell us the number of copies printed of each volume, and we see that 2000 copies have been printed of the first edition of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, and 1000 copies of the others. Each copy, we further observe, is numbered.

The third thing to notice is the translation. Now an English edition of *Thus Spake Zarathustra* has already been issued by Mr. Fisher Unwin, the translator being Alexander Tille. And the best way to estimate the success of the translation will be to quote a short passage, first from Mr. Tille, and then from Mr. Common. Let us take the first stanza of the lament of the magician.

MR. TILLE.

Who warmeth me, who loveth me still?
Give hot hands!
Give heart's coal-pans!
Stretched out, shivering,
Like one half dead whose feet are warmed,
Shaken, alas! by unknown fevers,
Trembling from the icy, pointed arrows of frost,
Hunted, thought, by thee!
Unutterable! Veiled! Horrid one!
Thou huntsman behind the clouds!
Struck to the ground by thee,
Thou mocking eye that gazeth at me from the dark!
Thus I lie,
Bend, writhe, tortured
By all eternal tortures,
Smitten
By thee, cruellest of huntsmen,
Thou unknown *God* . . .

MR. COMMON.

Who warm'th me, who lov'th me still?
Give ardent fingers!
Give heartening charcoal-warmers!
Prone, outstretched, trembling,
Like him, half dead and cold, whose feet one warm'th—
And shaken, ah! by unfamiliar fevers,
Shivering with sharpened, icy-cold frost-arrows,
By thee pursued, my fancy!
Ineffable! Recondite! Sore-frightening!
Thou huntsman 'hind the cloud-banks!
Now lightning-struck by thee,
Thou mocking eye that me in darkness watcheth:
——Thus do I lie,
Bend myself, twist myself, convulsed
With all eternal torture,
And smitten
By thee, cruellest huntsman,
Thou unfamiliar—*God* . . .

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

If, after all the uneasiness introduced by the criticism of the Bible, some one would come and tell us where to find an unerring authority in Religion, he would unhesitatingly be called Benefactor. For the Roman Catholic Church in our day no more has such an authority than the Protestant Church. And as to the Protestant Church, her position in the matter of authority is at present, says Mr. Leckie, beyond all parallel, critical and troubled.

The Rev. J. H. Leckie has written a book on *Authority in Religion* (T. & T. Clark; 5s.). He has written it evidently after long study of the subject. For not only is there no literature of the subject worth mentioning which he does not mention; but besides that, he is able to make the subordinate issues subordinate, and to throw the real question into clear relief. So that any one who reads his book will at once see what progress has been made in the discussion of authority, and where we now stand.

The question is one of conscience. It is one of conscience with Catholic and Protestant alike. It is one of conscience for the believer in the Church as for the believer in the Bible. It is one of conscience for the believer in Christ.

For, to take the last first, Christ always appealed to conscience, and always appeals. 'What think ye,' He said, 'if a man have an hundred sheep and one of them be lost,—*what think ye?*' And there is no Church or Scripture that does not stand or fall just by its appeal to conscience.

But what makes conscience? Not the inheritance or the upbringing of any individual. 'She keeps ever crying, "Conscience, conscience,"' complains Knox of Queen Mary. And he kept ever crying, 'Conscience, conscience' himself. But his conscience was better than Queen Mary's, because it contained more of the things which belong to Religion and Ethics, more of the communion or common consent of those whom the truth has made free.

The Books of the Month.

The Shorter Catechism.

The Rev. John Burgess, M.A., has published the third and last part of his *Notes on the Shorter Catechism* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson; 6d.). And now we wish most heartily to commend the Notes—and the Shorter Catechism.

Fitzgerald.

Of all the editions of *The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám*, or of Edward Fitzgerald's translation thereof, is there any that excels in beauty, or at any rate in beauty and utility combined, the edition which has just been published by Messrs. A. & C. Black (7s. 6d. net)? It is edited by Dr. Reynold Alleyne Nicholson, Lecturer in Persian in the University of Cambridge, who has written a most instructive Introduction and added some necessary notes. That is all that need be said about its usefulness. Its beauty is made up of many things. First the coloured prints—ancient and modern, Eastern and Western, combined; and then the artistic margins, the printing and the paper. The binder's white cloth blue device and gold letters come last in the account, but first in effectiveness.

The Indissolubility of Marriage.

Mr. Stuart Lawrence Tyson, M.A., Professor of New Testament Language and Interpretation in the University of the South, has written a book on *The Teaching of our Lord as to the Indissolubility of Marriage*. The book is not large, but it is large enough to enable Professor Tyson to examine the relevant passages minutely. He comes to the conclusion that in the teaching of our Lord marriage is indissoluble. What, then, about the two passages in St. Matthew (5^{32} 19^{9}), 'except for the cause of fornication'? 'Looking at the matter from every point of view,' says Professor Tyson, 'I cannot regard the twice-repeated exception, both on account of its relation to its own context and because of its total divergence from the independent witness of three apostolic writers of the New Testament, to be a genuine saying of Christ, although, on the other hand, the witness of antiquity compels me to confess that it formed an integral portion of the First Gospel.'

A New Diatessaron.

Those who are disappointed with their Daily Readings might try a little book called *Christ in Daily Life* (Allenson; 1s. 6d. net). It is described as 'a consecutive narrative of the life of our Lord, compiled from the Four Gospels, and arranged in one continuous story for daily reading.' On the cover it is stated that the life of our Lord is arranged 'for the first time' in one continuous story. But there was a Diatessaron long, long ago. This is better than Tatian's Diatessaron, however, because the author, Miss Adelaide M. Cameron, has her orthodoxy vouched for at the Deanery of St. Paul's.

The Hellenic Religion.

Mr. Blackwell of Oxford has published Dr. Farnell's Inaugural Lecture as Wilde Lecturer in Natural and Comparative Religion (1s. net). It is a very able sketch of the higher elements in Hellenic Religion.

Dom Connolly on Narsai.

It is a long time since any addition has been made to the Cambridge Texts and Studies. We feared that with the seventh volume the series had come to an end. But here comes No. 1 of Vol. VIII. It is *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, translated into English with an Introduction by Dom R. H. Connolly, M.A., of Downside Abbey, with an Appendix by Edmund Bishop (Cambridge Press; 6s. net). Like 'all Gaul' the book is divided into three parts, and they are very nearly equal in length. Dom Connolly's Introduction occupies seventy-six pages; the Homilies themselves, with a few additional notes, eighty-four; and Mr. Bishop's Appendix, eighty.

Who was Narsai? The editor answers the question in his Introduction. Narsai was the famous teacher who founded the great Nestorian School at Nisibis, after the expulsion of the followers of Ibas from Edessa, 457 A.D. Before he came to Nisibis he taught for twenty years at Edessa. Thus his Homilies are of great importance for a study of the rise and growth of Nestorianism among the Eastern Syrians. But four of them are also of much liturgical value, and these are the four that have been chosen for translation here. One of them is nothing less than a careful and detailed exposition of the Mass. Other two describe the rite of Baptism. The subject of the fourth is the Church and the Priesthood.

Mr. Bishop's Appendix deals with certain points which illustrate the rite followed by Narsai as compared with other rites. These points are: (1) Ritual splendour in Divine Service; (2) the Eucharistic Service as a subject of fear and awe to the Faithful; (3) the Diptychs; (4) Litanies; (5) Silent recitals in the mass of the Faithful; (6) the Moment of Consecration.

Hume Brown's Scotland.

Professor Hume Brown has completed his *History of Scotland*. The first volume was published in 1900, and stereotyped in 1902. The second volume was published in 1902, and reprinted in 1905. The third volume is published this month (Cambridge University Press; 4s. 6d. net each). Though only in three volumes, as against Andrew Lang's four and Hill Burton's eight, it is a notable achievement. For Professor Hume Brown has gone to the sources, to sources which, in some cases, Hill Burton never heard of. And after making himself thoroughly acquainted with all that can be known, he has written a history which may be more influential than either Andrew Lang's or Hill Burton's, because it is written for use both in the public school and in the humble home. And we are thankful that he and not another has written it. For he is in sympathy with that which has given Scotland her place in the world, her sense of responsibility to God and man, her Puritanism, if you choose to call it so. He is not to be accused of fanaticism, however. The fanatic is extinct, even in Scotland. But it is a great thing that he has set himself against the tendency to ridicule those ideals and influences which go to the making of character. This is of more consequence than that he should be original in the handling of his sources. But he has both advanced our knowledge of the history of Scotland and shown the influences which have made it—his great achievement lies in that.

Is the book accurate? It was a shock to discover a wrong date for the Union of the Churches —1902 instead of 1900. But it set us searching. It is the only wrong date we have discovered.

The Confessions.

Messrs. Chatto & Windus have published an edition of *The Confessions of Saint Augustine* (7s. 6d. net), which the fashion papers would call a dream of beauty. The translation is Pusey's. Temple Scott has edited the book, and Alice Meynell has written the Introduction to it. All this is as it has been, is now, and very often shall be. The difference which makes the 'dream' is due to the illustrations.

Professor Toffteen.

The second volume has just appeared of a notable series of books, published at the University of Chicago Press for the Oriental Society of the Western Theological Seminary. This Society was founded in October 1906 by Dr. Olaf A. Toffteen, Professor of Semitic Languages and Old Testament Literature in the Seminary. Its purpose is to promote research work in the Old Testament and related subjects.

Its publications consist up to date of two volumes, both written by Professor Toffteen himself, the first being entitled *Ancient Chronology*, Part I.; the second, *The Historic Exodus* ($2.50 net). Both are handsome volumes, of thoroughly competent scholarship and throbbing with life.

The subject of the second volume is the Exodus of Israel. But before that topic is entered upon, a minute examination is made of the documents which have to be dealt with—J, E, D, and P. Then comes the equally minute examination of all the evidence for the Exodus. The conclusion is reached that there were two separate Exodi (the word is Professor Toffteen's own). There were two migrations into Egypt; two distinct sojournings there; two exodi, by two routes that were similar and yet not the same; two law-givings, the one at Horeb, and the other at a different mountain, whose name was Sinai.

Dr. Gurney Masterman.

Dr. E. W. Gurney Masterman has become generally known in this country through his contributions to Hastings' single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*. In the States he is known by his frequent contributions to the *Biblical World*. He is one of the rather small band of men who know Palestine and can tell what they know. But if he knows Palestine well, he knows Galilee intimately. Hence his *Studies in Galilee*, the new book which he has issued through the University of Chicago Press ($1 net), must be read by every lover of that least of all lands. It is a book that will cost no effort to read, and yet will permanently enrich the mind of the reader. The illustrations also are excellent, exceptionally well chosen, and well executed.

The Essence of the Gospel.

From the Church Missionary Society comes *Thought and Discipleship* (1s. 6d.), a volume which contains ten addresses given at the C.M.S. London Summer School in June 1909. It contains an address on the Essence of the Gospel by Professor Sanday, an address on the Outlook of

the Apostles by Bishop Chase, and other addresses not less noteworthy than these.

Evangelical Heterodoxy.

The Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon is amazed at his own audacity in issuing a volume of sermons with such a title as *Evangelical Heterodoxy* (Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). Let him take heart of grace. We are all evangelically heterodox now, or at least we hope we are. For what is evangelical heterodoxy? It is simply the interpretation of the Gospel to our own day and generation. If Mr. Morgan Gibbon were not evangelical, he would of course be nothing. If he were not heterodox, it would be easy to pass him by. But his purpose is good. He wants to protest against all those heretics who call themselves Christians and have forsworn Christ.

Constable's Sixpenny Series.

Notice the names of some of the novels in Constable's Sixpenny Series. We have seen *The Old Dominion* and *By Order of the Company*, both by Mary Johnston; also Robert Barr's *The Measure of the Rule*, Clara Louise Burnham's *The Opened Shutters*, and two of George Meredith's, the rest of Meredith being no doubt on the way.

The Bible.

We are always complaining that people read books about the Bible and not the Bible. But we are always writing books about the Bible. The latest is Professor W. F. Lofthouse's book on *The Bible, its Origin and Authority* (Culley; 1s. 6d. net). It deals with external things and with internal. It deals with the Bible and its names, the manuscripts, the versions, and all the rest. Then it deals with the Bible as revelation, and last of all with the Spirit and the Word. And the last chapter alone is good enough to give the book distinction.

Ballard the Apologist.

Industrious and indefatigable, alert and well-informed, Dr. Frank Ballard deserves the title of 'Defender of the Faith' more than any king who has ever stamped it on his coinage. In his new book, *The People's Religious Difficulties* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net), he has published a thousand questions and answers—questions asked at open conferences and answered by himself. The questions, he tells us, are all printed exactly as they were received. For they were nearly all sent up in writing, and those that were not so sent were taken down by him in shorthand. It is a unique volume and of immense utility to lecturer and preacher everywhere, not only for its answers, but also for the questions that called them forth. We do not mean that these questions are a complete reflexion of the mind of the public on Religion. It is not always the average man that asks a question, and the question does not always express the questioner's meaning. But again we say it is a unique book and of incalculable utility.

From Drummond's Tract Depôt in Stirling there comes the annual acceptable packet. Send for it without seeing it. There are two books of stories and three packets of Gospel booklets, all of the excellent of the earth.

Peake and Inge.

In a somewhat unattractive binding—but binding is a matter of taste, and therefore subject to much variety of opinion—Messrs. Duckworth issue the first two volumes of their new series of 'Studies in Theology.' These two volumes are *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* by Professor A. S. Peake, and *Faith* by Professor W. R. Inge (2s. 6d. net each). There is no reference to a general editor, and no indication of the general purport of the series. But Professor Peake, with his usual frankness and force, makes it perfectly clear what his book is about. It is the application to the New Testament of that method of study which is known by the name of Higher Criticism. And that is good. It is better than anything else that Professor Peake could have done at the present moment for the ordinary Bible reader. The ordinary Bible reader knows something now of the higher criticism of the Old Testament. And he knows that on the whole it has made the Old Testament more credible than before. But he is more interested in the New Testament than in the Old. And he is more concerned about it. Professor Peake's book is just the book for him. For he will have perfect confidence in Professor Peake's handling of the New Testament,—that he is hiding nothing behind his hand. And after reading Professor Peake's book he will have not less but more confidence in the New Testament.

The purpose of Professor Inge's book is not so

easily arrived at. Its fullest title—*Faith and its Psychology*—is on the back of the binding. The shorter title *Faith* is all that the title-page itself contains. The addition of *and its Psychology* could not possibly be due to the binder? If so, he is a clever binder. For it is not the dogmatics but the psychology of faith that we are all interested in. And more than that, it is the psychology of faith that is the subject of the book. Now, Professor Inge could not have chosen a subject more in need of exposition than Faith. It is at once the simplicity and the difficulty of the gospel. And there are very few men of our time who could have drawn us more inevitably into the study of it.

Ex-President Warren.

Dr. W. F. Warren, formerly President of Boston University, has published a volume on *The Earliest Cosmologies* (Eaton & Mains; $1.50 net). Its fuller title is 'The Universe as pictured in Thought by the Ancient Hebrews, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Iranians, and Indo-Aryans.' And it is further described as 'A Guidebook for Beginners in the Study of Ancient Literatures and Religions.'

Now it may be supposed that such a book on such a subject, whatever the beginner in the study of ancient literatures and religions may think of it, is not very likely to arrest the attention of any but students or experts. That expectation, however, leaves out of account the fact that any subject under heaven may be made interesting to any man on earth, by an author who is sufficiently interested in it himself. President Warren is thoroughly interested in his subject. He gives the impression that no other subject exists worth taking an interest in, either by him or by us. Having caught our attention by his diagrams he holds it to the end. For he has a free command of appropriate language, and he throws all the uninteresting items of literary reference down to the bottom of his pages.

English Poetry.

To the Oxford editions of 'Standard Authors,' Mr. Frowde has added *The Pageant of English Poetry* (2s.), which is not an edition of any English author, but, for the money, the best collection of the best English poems that has yet been published.

The Binding and the Book.

If publishers only knew how many books are bought for their binding they would see to it that the binding of books kept pace with the progress of the arts and manufactures. The binding of the Rev. J. E. McFadyen's new book, *The City with Foundations* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.), is so attractive that, although it is only a volume of sermons, we will predict for it a large circulation. It is a volume of sermons that are unusually short and unusually pithy.

The Ethic of Jesus.

If it is ever true, as is so often asserted, that the Professor's Chair is the grave of mental activity, it is certainly not true in the case of Professor Stalker of Aberdeen. It would be nearer the truth to say that his mental activity began with his appointment to the Chair of Church History, so keenly alive is he to every movement of thought within the whole range of Religion and Ethics. His new book on *The Ethic of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.) is his own. But it is also the world's. For at every point his studies have been corrected by the studies of other men, gaining thereby in authority, and no doubt also in insight, without losing anything of the originality. This control is probably to a large extent unconscious; it is not the book that is full of the religious thought of our time, it is the mind of the author. The book, we say, is his own.

And now, in turn, Dr. Stalker's 'Ethic of Jesus' will pass into the minds of other men. It will pass first into the minds of preachers. It will show preachers how to preach a morality that is not mere morality, but is the inevitable and beautiful outcome of justification by faith alone. And from the preacher it will pass into the lives of all men, encouraging them to the accomplishment of that which God requires of them.

The first two volumes of this year's issue of Maclaren's 'Expositions of Holy Scripture' are ready. The one is occupied with the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* and with the first five chapters of the Second Epistle, the other with the *Epistle to the Ephesians* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. each).

Moffatt's 'Meredith.'

George Meredith: A Primer to the Novels (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), by James Moffatt. Who is James Moffatt? Has he been Private Secretary to George Meredith and watched his ways and the working of his mind, his outgoing and incoming, his downsitting and uprising, day after day? Or has he been Reader to Meredith's Publisher all the years; and has he received the MSS. with deepening interest, with affectionate touch that grew into reverence, as he passed them on prepared for the printer? Or has he been Reviewer for half a century on some of the great literary organs, some weekly that gave space to a full review and expected that its reviewer would know everything that Meredith had ever said and done? Or is he a private gentleman who has given his whole time for many years to the reading of contemporary fiction, and for the last few years to the reading of Meredith alone, that knowing Meredith only, he may know him through and through? James Moffatt is the Rev. James Moffatt, D.D., Author of *The Historical New Testament*, and *The Golden Book of John Owen*, and Minister of the United Free Church of Scotland at Broughty Ferry.

Professor Bartoli.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a translation of Professor Bartoli's *Il Christianesimo*, under the title of *The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome* (6s.). It is no disparagement of the book to say that the most interesting part of it is the bit of autobiography called the Preface. 'Until eighteen months ago,' says Professor Bartoli, 'I was a member of the Society of Jesus; now I am no more so. I was not expelled from that Society. I left it of my own accord, because the religious opinions and doctrines I held did not any longer agree with the opinions and doctrines held sacred by that Society.'

Yet Dr. Bartoli is no modernist. 'As a matter of fact,' he says, 'I opposed that religious movement from the very beginning, and I did not conceal from Father Tyrrell my distrust of it.' His faith, he tells us, rests on the Bible, but not on the Bible of the extreme Higher Critics, on the Bible of the Reformers of the sixteenth century: 'Their faith is mine, their belief is my belief.'

One day in 1896, Professor Bartoli undertook to answer an attack on the claims of the Papacy. He was fresh from his studies and a newly-made Doctor in Theology. He thought it an easy thing to convince the writer of the article of the weakness of his position. He quoted from the 'De Unitate Ecclesiæ' of St. Cyprian certain words which settled once for all the claims of the Papacy to universal domination. And then he discovered that the passage was an interpolation. The shock he received was not due to the discovery of an interpolation in St. Cyprian, but to the discovery that his professors had never given him a hint of its spuriousness. He determined to study the subject on his own account and thoroughly. He wrote this book, and left the Society of Jesus.

The Century Bible Handbooks.

Principal Adeney, the editor of the 'Century Bible Handbooks' has himself written the handbook on *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ* (Jack). The complaint is sometimes made that the captain of the team, if he is a bowler, is apt to put himself on to bowl at the most critical moment. But if he is the best bowler there is no complaint. Dr. Adeney was entitled to take for himself the greatest subject that his handbooks have to deal with. This is not ambition overleaping itself. There is evidence of much independent spade work.

The Dates of Genesis.

Of all the studies that fascinate men on earth, is there any to be compared with the study of Chronology? The Rev. F. A. Jones has given his life to it, as many a man has done before him. And he not only finds it fascinating for himself, he also makes it fascinating for others. You will read his book on *The Dates of Genesis* (Kingsgate Press; 5s. net) with the deepest interest. You will doubt his method and disagree with his conclusion, but you will read him. His conclusion is that Archbishop Ussher is accurate; and the world was created 4004 years B.C. His method is to count the years of the lives of the antediluvians and discount altogether the evidence of the Babylonian and Egyptian monuments.

Jainism, and the Song.

Messrs. Luzac have imported into this country a small volume on the *History and Literature of Jainism*, by Mr. U. D. Barodia, B.A. (1s. 6d. net).

The same publishers have issued *The Targum to the Song of Songs* (1s. 6d. net). It is a translation

from the Aramaic made by Professor Hermann Gollancz, D.Lit. The Targum to the Song of Songs is a paraphrase rather than a translation. And because it is a paraphrase we see how the author understood his original. The Beloved is God, the bride is the congregation of Israel, the song is an allegorical outline of Jewish history from the Exodus to the coming of the Messiah. Origen accepted this interpretation from the Talmud, and it persisted in the Christian Church down to this very generation.

Islam.

Messrs. Luzac have also issued *Islam: Her Moral and Spiritual Value*, 'a rational and psychological study,' by Major Arthur Glyn Leonard, with a Foreword by Syed Ameer Ali, M.A., C.I.E. (2s. 6d. net). Major Leonard concludes that Muhammadanism is by no means so bad as it is usually writ down, and that 'the so-called *Moslem menace* is but a wraith of an overheated imagination—the bogie conjured up by a hectoring and arrogant theocracy, backed up unfortunately by an indiscreet and tactless Press, ever ready to exaggerate any piece of cheap claptrap into the sensation of the moment.'

Westcott.

There could be no clearer evidence of the strong influence which Westcott exercised than the number of his posthumous publications. For his case is not like that of Hort, who scarcely published anything in his lifetime. Westcott published a great deal himself. But there are men to edit and men to buy everything that he left unpublished, whether finished or unfinished.

The latest is a volume of lectures on Church History, which he delivered at Cambridge during the early years of his tenure of the Regius Professorship of Divinity. There were three courses: one on the Early Persecutions, one on the Age of Constantine, and one on the Nicene Council. They have been edited by his son, the Rev. Arthur Westcott, M.A., Rector of Crayke, who has called the book *The Two Empires* (Macmillan; 6s.)—the two empires being the Church and the World.

Fourth Corinthians.

Dr. G. H. Rendall, Headmaster of Charterhouse, has come to the conclusion that St. Paul wrote four letters to the Corinthians, one of which has been lost, and three of which are in existence. He expresses his conviction and gives the reasons for it in a volume entitled *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Macmillan; 3s. net). The first letter was written from Ephesus in the year 53. That letter is lost; but it is referred to in 1 Co 5^9. Next year, perhaps in March, St. Paul received a dispatch from the Corinthian Church, and replied to it, probably in April, by what we call the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The following year, perhaps in February, he revisited Corinth. On returning to Ephesus he wrote the letter which now occupies chapters 10 to 13 of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. St. Paul left Ephesus after the tumult and passed from Troas to Philippi. There he wrote the letter which now occupies the first nine chapters of our Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

Myers' 'St. Paul.'

Have you mastered Myers' *Saint Paul*? If you have, or if you have not, carry with you wherever you go the little square, light-brown leather-bound edition just published by Messrs. Macmillan (1s. net). It belongs to the 'Gem' series.

Galatians.

The editor of 'The Bible for Home and School' is to be congratulated on getting the volume on *The Epistle to the Galatians* from Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale (Macmillan; 2s. 6d.). Some of the conclusions may be startling, such as the conclusion that Galatians is the earliest of the Pauline Epistles, but they are all the result of the most competent scholarship.

Bagehot.

Mr. Melrose has published the second volume of Selections made by Mr. Cuthbert Lennox from the writings of Walter Bagehot, and entitled *Estimations in Criticism* (2s. 6d. net). Its contents are the essays on seven great prose writers—Gibbon, Macaulay, Scott, Dickens, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Sterne, and Thackeray. We commend the book at the beginning of another winter session to the writers of essays in all the clubs and literary societies throughout the kingdom. There is no dazzling cleverness in Bagehot: there is honest appreciation expressed in a homely, healthy, English tongue.

The Apocrypha.

The Rev. Herbert Pentin, M.A., is a man with a mission. His mission is to introduce the present generation to the Apocrypha. For this end he is Warden of the International Society of the Apocrypha, and edits the monthly journal of the Society.

He is a man who takes his mission seriously and conducts it wisely, the latest evidence of his sagacity being a volume of *Devotions from the Apocrypha* (Methuen; 2s.).

Haddon's 'Races of Man.'

Messrs. Milner are the publishers of 'The XXth Century Science' series—illustrated books in crown octavo, bound in art vellum, and sold at 1s. net. One of them is *The Races of Man and their Distribution*, by Dr. Haddon of Cambridge. It is probably the best book in the series.

Morgan & Scott.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published a companion volume to *The Master's Touch*. It is a further selection from the poems of Edith Gilling Cherry. Its title is *The Master's Treasures* (1s. 6d. net). The Bishop of Durham gives the little book a God-speed: 'I am *very* glad that more of Miss Cherry's beautiful verse is to appear. God speed the book.'

This is the first of a pretty long list of books which Messrs. Morgan & Scott have had the courage to issue this month. Three of them are cheaper reprints of Mr. F. B. Meyer's familiar Character Studies in the Old Testament—*Israel*, *Moses*, and *Elijah* (1s. net each). Two of them remind us that there is an institution in the land entitled the British Museum. Ada R. Habershon has written a useful account of the connexion between *The Bible and the British Museum* (2s. 6d. net), and Lettice Bell has written *Why and What at the British Museum* (1s. 6d. net), 'to the big family of little *Whys* who have been, are going, and cannot go to the British Museum.'

There are three missionary books in the list—*Dawn in Toda Land*, by C. F. Ling, illustrated from photographs (1s. 6d. net); *The Revival in Manchuria*, by the Rev. James Webster (6d. net); and *Pomegranate: The Story of a Chinese School-Girl*, by Jennie Beckingsale, B.A. (2s. 6d. net).

Then there is *The Men's Hymn-Book*, compiled by G. E. Morgan, M.A., as supplementary to *Sacred Songs and Solos*, for use at men's meetings of all kinds (6d.); and there is *The Herald of Mercy Annual* (1s.)

There is a volume of sermons by the Rev. F. S. Webster, M.A., with the title of *My Lord and I* (2s. 6d. net). There is 'an attempt to set forth the Scriptural doctrine of holiness,' by the Rev. George F. Trench, B.A., with the title of *The Life that is Life Indeed* (2s. 6d. net)—still quite elementary. For it is just on the subject of perfection that we seem determined never to go on unto perfection. There is an exposition of *The Prophet Joel*, by A. C. Gaebelein (3s. 6d. net). Joel is taken to be the oldest of the prophets, and the exposition is on somewhat rigidly conservative lines. Next, there is a curious conglomeration of all the odds and ends of latter-day religions, with the curious title of *The Number of Man* (5s.), the author being Philip Mauro, Counsellor-at-Law. Here are to be found remarks and reflexions on New Theologies, Spiritism, Capitalism, Zionism, Latter-Day Idols, Evolution, Money, the Coming Catholicism, and the Ultimate Intellectualism.

And the best is left to the last. It is a delightful book on *The Ideal Christian Home* (3s. 6d. net), compiled by Helen S. Dyer. Why is it said to be compiled? It contains many good quotations, certainly; but the book is literature, written with fine feeling and delicate choice of language. Mrs. Dyer never lets sentiment get the better of her common sense. But she knows how to give a pleasant savour to common sense by the alternate touch of wholesome humour and healthy sentiment. The anecdotes are not all new, but they are all good and in their proper place.

'When Philip Henry sought the hand of the only daughter and heiress of Mr. Matthews of Broad Oak, the father demurred, saying that though Mr. Henry was an excellent preacher and a gentleman, yet he did not know whence he came. "True," said the daughter, "but I know where he is going, and I should like to go with him."' This daughter became the mother of Matthew Henry, the Commentator.

The Apocalypse.

Canon Scott of Manchester has published six lectures on the Book of Revelation which he delivered during Lent 1909, in Manchester Cathedral. The title is simply *The Apocalypse* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). The lectures are inter-

pretation rather than what is called introduction. But at the end of the volume there is an introductory note on the date of the Apocalypse, in which Canon Scott gives good reasons for believing that the Book was written somewhere about 69 A.D.

Principal Whyte.

There is no man now who can take the place of Mr. Gladstone and with a post card send a book into a large circulation. The nearest is Dr. Whyte. But his method is better. For in the first place he chooses the right book—the book or books of an old Puritan for preference, though he will not despise a mystic of the Church of Rome. And in the next place he studies his author thoroughly and writes a readable book about him.

The new author is Thomas Shepard, and the whole title of the new book is *Thomas Shepard, Pilgrim Father and Founder of Harvard: His Spiritual Experience and Experimental Preaching* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 2s. 6d.).

In the Likeness of Men.

The everlasting interest is Christ Himself. *In the Likeness of Men* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. 6d. net), Short Studies in the Life of our Lord on Earth, by the Rev. Thomas Marjoribanks, B.D. of Callander, would receive attention, even if it were nothing in itself, because of the association of the book with Him. What it is in itself, and that is not a little, is altogether due to the closeness of its contact. It is good refreshing, simply because of the well it is drawn from.

Children of the Far East.

For the Work Party, Woman's Missionary Meeting, or whatever it may be called, the book to read this winter is either *Children of India* by Janet Harvey Kelman, or *Children of China* by Colin Campbell Brown (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. 6d. net each).

The Spectator.

Its enemies have always said that *The Spectator* was a pulpit, arrogant and unanswerable. Now, the editor admits it—admits that it is a pulpit. For he has written a Preface to certain *Lay Sermons from the Spectator* (Pitman; 5s. net). The preacher is M. C. E.—man or woman? Previous Lay Sermons published (not from *The Spectator*) were by Professor Huxley and Mrs. Craik. Let us guess woman; not from the lightness of touch, but from the fineness of discrimination. There is a sermon on 'A Judge and a Divider.' That is what Christ refused to be. That is what this Christian is.

Lawes.

The biography entitled *W. G. Lawes of Savage Island and New Guinea* (R.T.S.; 5s. net) has little of the swing and little of the sweep of the great biography of his friend and colleague Chalmers. We are inclined to the thought that a great opportunity has been lost. For Lawes was a Nimrod of our day, a mighty hunter before the Lord, and he deserved the graphic pen of a great biographer.

Nevertheless the book grows on one. The second reading is better than the first. If it is not a momentous biography, it is a true history. It is manifest that Mr. King has put conscience into the book, saying none other things than those which he was sure he could stand by.

The Dark Places.

Mr. Andrew D. Stewart has cast his eye across the whole history of modern missions, and out of it he has selected illustrations of adventure, suffering, progress, and blessing. The title of the book is *Out of the Darkness* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d.).

Job.

The Rev. David Davies, formerly of Brighton (and then known by his *Talks with Men, Women, and Children*), now of Cardiff, has written a commentary on *The Book of Job* in two volumes, of which the first volume is issued (Simpkin, Marshall; 5s. net). Its strength lies in a combination of the spiritual and the literary. Mr. Davies is not strong in introduction, with which, indeed, he has little patience. But into the spiritual appeal, with which he is at home, he introduces a literary parallel here and there with great effect, and sometimes a literary contrast with yet greater effect.

Thus there was a day in the life of Job which stood out in his memory, as the day of darkness beyond all other days. Mr. Davies tells us what that memory meant to Job by quoting a poem which fixes the memory of a day of *brightness*.

Into our lives—a rose amid the thorns,
A star in the night—there came one perfect day,
Framed all in sunshine, lit with light of love,
And compassed round with blessings ev'ry way.
Hush, let us keep it sweet,
By God's own grace—complete.

Now, though the shadows gather round our path;
Now, though the darkness rise and hide the light,
Now, though we never reap life's aftermath,
Nor ever touch again so fair a height;
Now, let come what may,
We know one perfect day.

Sweet, looking up, we know that pain must rise,
And strife, to mar that day's most perfect peace;
But looking farther in God's light of love,
We see the land where all the discords cease;
And where, God grant, we may
Re-live that perfect day.

London at Prayer.

Is it legitimate to use the word 'prayer' with the meaning of worship? Is it expedient to use it so in the title of a book? *London at Prayer* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d. net) is the title of a book which describes the methods of worship, nay, the actual fact of worship of twenty-one representative congregations of London worshippers.

The book is written by Mr. Charles Morley, and illustrated from drawings by Hugh Thomson and other artists. And it is difficult to say which is more realistic and emotional, the description or the drawing. One who visits Westminster Abbey, or John Wesley's Chapel, or the Foundling Hospital, or the Army Rally, or the Jewish Synagogue, or any other of these services after reading this book will probably be disappointed. Not that this book is untrue, but that the visitor may not carry the seeing eye or the sympathy.

The Text of the Bible.

Messrs. Skeffington have published a second and enlarged edition of Dr. Oesterley's book on *Our Bible Text* (2s. net). It contains two additional chapters—one on a lost Greek Uncial Codex of the Psalms, the other on a Greek Manuscript of the Minor Prophets. The literature also has been brought up to date.

The Text of the N.T.

Dr. James Drummond has written a little book on *The Transmission of the Text of the New Testament* (Sunday School Association; 1s. net). It is intended, he says, to provide those who are ignorant of Greek with some elementary knowledge of the mode in which the text of the New Testament has come down to us. What are the books which the writer of such an elementary booklet makes use of? First, he says, Kenyon's *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*; next, Maude Thompson's *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*; then two foreign books, Birt's *Das Antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur*, and Berger's *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen age*; lastly, Westcott's article 'Vulgate' in Smith, and H. J. White's account of Codex Amiatinus in *Studia Biblica*. It is an interesting little library. But it is neither complete nor quite up to date.

Lourdes.

'Devotion to Mary is the crown of all good on this earth, just as hatred of Our Lady, alas—is, even in this world, a mark of eternal reprobation.'

That sentence occurs quite naturally somewhere about the middle of *The Glories of Lourdes* (Washbourne; 3s. 6d.). It expresses the spirit of the book. Canon Justin Rousseil wrote *The Glories of Lourdes* in order to celebrate the glory of the Virgin. And there is no half-heartedness in him. He believes in Lourdes, and in all its wonders. And he believes that all that Lourdes has done for men has been done by the Virgin Mary. It is a strangely moving story, as it is told here with so great simplicity of faith. But the Lord Jesus Christ, alas! is nowhere. He is not once named, so far as we can discover, throughout the whole book. He does not once come into the author's mind. Yet we are told that *The Glories of Lourdes* has been 'blessed by the Pope, praised by two Cardinals, approved by three Bishops, honoured by a letter from the Abbé Bertrin and a preface by Dr. Boissarie, and it is universally admitted by the Catholic press in France to be the last word, whether historical, poetical, or mystical, on the events of the famous Grotto of Massabielle.' Is it not time we had re-named the religion of Lourdes and called it Marianity? It does not seem to be Christianity.

The R.P.A. Reprints.

The new volumes of the R.P.A. cheap reprints are Herbert Spencer's *The Man versus the State*, and Grant Allen's *The Hand of God* (Watts; 6d. each).

Books for the Young.

Let us single out for special notice two books published by the S.P.C.K. They are suitable for children of ten or eleven. *A Little Military Knight* (2s.) reminds one of *Little Lord Fauntleroy*, and does not fall very far short of it. The author, E. M. Green, has succeeded, we believe, in adding one to the list of children's classics.

What will appeal to a child most? the things of the imagination. And in this book there is sanctified imagination. After imagination comes incident. The little military knight has many adventures. The third thing which affects a child is the wording of the story, and here we have a tale told in language that is simple and picturesque.

The second children's book which we would recommend is *Mr. Punch and Party* (1s. 6d.), by Louisa Bedford. Ursula and Alick come from India to stay with their guardian Mr. Punch. This is an account of their adventures, and of the change which took place in them.

But now, let us recommend a third book. If it is not quite so edifying, it is more exciting than either of these. *Two in a Tangle* (1s. 6d.), by Alice Massie, contains a most realistic account of what happened to Kathleen and Philip O'Brien on a cycling tour. The Secretary of the S.P.C.K. has been very fortunate in securing three children's books so good as these.

Next, we have four books which would be suitable for gifts in adult sewing classes, etc. Of these we like *Miss Haldane's Lodger*, by Katherine E. Vernham (1s.), best. The plot is cleverly worked out, and there is much earnest religious feeling. *Young Mrs. Harris* (2s.), by Lucy M. Parker is a brightly told tale of village life. The other two are *Meg's Fortune* (2s.), by Emily Pearson Finnemore, and *In Quest of a Heritage* (1s.).

Shepperton Manor (2s. 6d.), by the Rev. J. M. Neale, and *The Failure of a Hero* (2s.), by M. Bramston, are historical novels. The scene of the first is laid in the beginning of the seventeenth century, and of the second in the end of the sixteenth. We have had just a suspicion that historical tales are being overdone, but perhaps it is not so, since there is a short notice at the beginning of *Shepperton Manor* to say that it has been reprinted 'to meet a continuous demand.'

The Prize (Wells Gardner; 1s. 6d.) is a delightful children's magazine. The binding is attractive, and it contains twelve bright bold coloured pictures. The stories are written in the simple direct fashion that appeals to children, and they are well-sandwiched between poetry and pictures.

Chatterbox (Wells Gardner; 3s.)—wonderful value for the money—would make an excellent family gift. It contains over four hundred pages of continued and short stories, articles on many interesting and practical subjects, puzzles, anecdotes, jokes and poetry, and all profusely illustrated.

Identity in Creeds without Historical Connexion.

By Lawrence Heyworth Mills, D.D., Professor of Zend Philology in the University of Oxford.

Will you allow me to fix a point which involves expository exegesis at every line, and which seems somewhat difficult to keep from shifting; or rather to disentangle two interesting facts, the one from the other, and from their more or less equivocal connexions?

My business is this. I take it for granted that all unprejudiced readers of the Bible accede to the opinion that the pre-Exilic eschatology differed very greatly from its successor, the Exilic—and this, not only as regards the distinctness and intensity of the assertions in which each expressed certain views, but also as regards some vital points in the doctrines themselves.

We are especially struck with the absence of all animated immortality in the early books. Recall the monotone in Kings and Chronicles; the Kings of both Judah and Israel, good or bad, died in their day, 'were buried' in their respective sepulchres, and their varying sons 'reigned in their stead.' Where is there any hint of an account beyond the grave?—no judgment, no Heaven, and no Hell.

Even in the *Decalogue* how often we have all of us missed these hopes, in the exact place of all others where we should most expect to find them. All seems to be like the classic Hades, if indeed the pre-Exilic picture possessed quite so much activity.

But from the Exilic Scriptures onwards, these deficiencies are made up, focusing in Daniel, and in its splendid echo, Revelation. So the Creed moved on; not, indeed, without a singular dissenting side-current. The superior Sadducees were often high priests, especially under the Maccabees.

The items in the Exilic Creeds need hardly be recalled; they were, first, a *God-unity* of the better sort, with a *Holy Spirit* somewhat dimly figured, an *angelology* with named *archangels*, becoming also '*princes*,' and an *immortality* fully conscious and developed. There was a *Satan*, with his host, later the 'God of this world'; there was a *fall of man*, continuating Eden—with a *soteriology*—and a *virgin birth*, a *temptation* and a *victory*; a *resurrection*, a *forensic judgment*, a *millennium* in a *paradise* (N.T.), a *Heaven* and a *Hell*.

These points seem all very plain in the Exilic pages, and they were continuously asserted by the dominant(?) party,[1] even during the life of Christ, as long previously. But in *North Persia* these views had been settled, and quite as firmly and as fully enounced as their counterparts in Judah, with one added item of well-nigh supreme influence. Thus in North Persia there was also a *God-unity* (see the *Avesta* and the *Inscriptions*); for *Ahura* was the '*Greatest*,'—there can be but *One* Greatest. He was also *Creator* of 'this earth' and 'yon Heaven,' and, constructively, of all that was within them; there can be but *One Creator*. It is so *redundantly* everywhere in both *Avesta* and *Inscriptions*. He made man, as a matter of course. He made His angels, some of them angels only in a secondary sense. This last limitation intervenes from the sublime fact that the chief *archangels* were His *attributes personified* (see even Plutarch citing Theopompos; compare also the *Sabellian Trinity* for analogy and illustration). He created *Mithra*, at times almost His mate, recalling again the *Trinity*. The things called '*Gods*' in *Avesta* and *Inscriptions* were like our *angels*—the chief of them—and they by no means compromise the *God-unity*. He, *Ahura*, had also His *most holy* Spirit,—so others; I prefer '*most bounteous*' (this for safety). He had an *eternity*, while man had a *deathless long* life—immortality. There was a Devil,—the most pronounced in literature. In fact, he was a 'twin,' but evil, Deity. He had his *angels*, the chief being the harmful *Druj* or lie; and they were not fallen angels—the evil angels were *originally bad*.

There were falls of man, however. In some sixteen Edens, where the Devil wrought his work, though the Edens were not so graphic as in the Bible, man fell; and the story is not told so minutely as in Genesis. There was to be a judgment, closely personal, but not so full in most particulars as those in Daniel and Revelation, while one astonishing element, the Iranian Assize, was greatly superior (see below).

There was to be a *Restoring Renovator*—a good Saviour,—the *One* about to *prosper*. He was to be virgin born, but not immediately from the Divine Power. After his mythification, Zarathustra met a temptation, as did our Lord, Hercules, and Buddha. Zarathustra's was much like that in Matthew.

He was to overcome—but not to be ultimately crucified—his remote virgin-born descendant was to assist in raising the dead (cp. the N.T.). There was to be a *Paradise*[2] of risen and beautified mankind, to last for a *thousand years*,—with a Heaven and an antithetic Hell.

Here is obviously an identity in constitutive elements—articles, as it were, of a common faith, and each of dominant importance, with one or two supreme principles; and they must have exercised a deepened influence on either side. I suppose no one will think of disputing this. The *Avesta* texts, while they may bristle with minor difficulties everywhere, are irresistible here as to this. It protrudes and obtrudes everywhere in both *Avesta* and its sequents. The one point where North Persia went far beyond Exilic Judah (see above), was that of *Subjective Recompense*. Heaven was to consist, centrally, of good thoughts, words, and deeds; and, contrariwise, Hell of evil thoughts, words, and deeds. Virtue was in fact to be, for the most part, its own reward, and vice its own punishment.

Such were these two great systems—essentially

[1] Though 'life and immortality' needed to be more distinctly 'brought to light' at the Advent.

[2] The word 'Paradise' is here used in its general sense of walled-in garden.

twin-sisters or twin-brothers, as we might term them. And my object just at present is first to point them out, and then to view each of them as if there were absolutely no historical connexion between them. Not so most other writers who have seriously examined the point. For a long time back critics like Matter[1] (of Strassburg), Deutsch, a Jew (see his article in the *Quarterly* of about fifty years ago), and many others, have insisted upon the historical as well as the interior identity of the two systems; while, on the contrary, some non-experts, perhaps piqued at the situation, have actually reiterated their negations, not only denying all mutual influence between the Jews and Persians, but also asserting that the Jews never came in contact with the Persians.

Now, suppose that, for the sake of putting the facts in a clear light, we *accept* this latter view, hypothetically and for the moment. By doing so, it may be possible for us to unravel the tangled issues. Let the reader, then, for the moment provisionally accept, with me, for the sake of clearness, that extreme conservative negation, just mentioned. Let it be supposed that the Jews had indeed actually never heard the name of *Persia*, and that such a person as *Cyrus* had never patronized them in the matter of restoring their city and temple; that Is 44. 45 may be considered a forgery or otherwise explained away; that *Ezra* is a religious novel. Let us deny that the Jews were *Persian* subjects from about 539 B.C., till the *Achæmenids* went out. Let us assert that the hundred odd words supposed to be of *Persian* origin in the Exilic Bible are in fact wholly *Semitic*; that the expression *King of kings* did not come from Iran, and that it does not stand to-day upon *Behistun*; that '*Paradise*' was not uttered by Christ upon the cross, nor was it an *Avestic* expression; and that the *thousand years* of Paradise was not a familiar concept in *Avesta* and its descendants, unknown in Judah before *Revelation*.

What then? Why, simply, we have here before us two of the most obtrusive and, at the same time, also uncontested facts of well-nigh supreme interest in all our 'Records of the Past.' For no beginner in *Avesta* can overlook the *Persian* system, nor can a Bible-reader ignore the *Jewish* Exilic. Here, then, are *two systems*, with *essential elements* practically *identical*, differing greatly as to the fringes of their detail,—this of course,—and each has arisen and developed absolutely without any influence from the other, great or little, mediate or immediate. And if this be the state of the case, we have here obviously and simply the finest instance of that wonderful thing called *Parallel Development*, in all religious history; indeed, we might delete the adjective. Is it then permissible to us to close our mental eye to such a thing as this? I think not.

I will not enlarge; the thing is solemn enough, if anything be solemn. What I add is solely by way of postscript. First, there is the significant fact that, of these twin theologies, that of the *Avesta*, and its now lost sisters, was by far *more ancient* than its Jewish mate. For, putting the Gāthas at, say, 700 to 900 B.C., they presuppose some centuries for the slow growth of their system—being also closely related to the *Veda*, whose antecedents came down from *Iran* into *India*—whereas the Jewish dates from the Exile with little basis in the pre-Exilic documents. Secondly, the Persian twin of the two had a *vast field* of influence, many times greater than that reached or touched by the Jewish Exilic and post-Exilic before the date of Constantine. The field of the *Persian* scheme included millions(?), where Exilic *Judah* numbered tens of thousands. Thirdly, the Persian *civilization* was far higher. Recall the enormous military and political influence of *Persia*, her conquests and her annexations, from India to Egypt, and from the Caspian to the Ocean; recall also her interior organization, with her leading postal system, her military and business roads, 'every valley being exalted and every mountain and hill made low,' etc.—an exaggeration indeed, but still expressive. Yet, except these external particulars and the subjective recompense, the *two eschatologies are approximately identical* in their points as in their fervour.[2] And their separate origin, in which I personally partly believe, is one of the marvels of all experience. To ignore any item here is to be remiss in duty.

[1] *Histoire Critique de Gnosticisme*, 1828.

[2] The *Avesta* and *Inscriptions* are well-nigh the '*document*' of personal religious fervour, certainly so, next after the Psalms.

Contributions and Comments.

'As the Hart panteth after the Water Brooks' (Ps. xlii. 1).

THESE words are generally accepted as supplying a picture of the panting hart longing for water to quench its thirst. Delitzsch accepts as a satisfactory explanation the words of Riehm, which he quotes from the latter's *Handwörterbuch*: 'The stag, in great need of water in the heat of summer, and at rutting time, shows his longing for it by hanging out his tongue contrary to the custom of kindred ruminants.' Two difficulties, however, present themselves. The words for 'panteth' and 'water brooks' require fuller explanation.

מַעֲרֹג suggests more than 'desiring.' Gesenius does not accept the opinion of Hebrew writers who say that עָרַג properly expresses the cry of the deer; but both Luther and Beza understand it here as meaning 'to cry aloud.'

אֲפִיקֵי־מָיִם means more than water brooks. אָפִיק alone is a watercourse, and מַיִם which is added seems to indicate not merely a watercourse with sufficient water, even in summer, drought to quench the thirst of the panting hart, but a watercourse with abundance of water. The same word is used in Is 11^9, 'As the waters cover the sea.' Now the stag does not cry out when merely seeking to quench its thirst, nor does it need for this purpose the abundant supply of water suggested by the words of the Psalmist. Its desire can be amply satisfied at the tiniest rivulet that trickles in the bed of the mountain torrent.

The Psalmist's words seem to refer to circumstances entirely different and far more impressive. He has before his mind the hunted animal, pursued by beasts of prey, its ferocious enemies. The conduct of the hart in such circumstances ought to throw some light on the words of the Psalm.

The sport of stag hunting in England supplies us with the information we need. In Scottish deer forests men do not hunt the wild deer, they stalk them. Sportsmen scramble among rocks and crawl over heather while they gradually approach the quietly browsing stag, and when they come near enough the fatal shot is fired before the unsuspecting creature has a chance to flee for its life. In England the sportsman hunts the stag with highly trained hounds. The hunted beast can always run for its life. It is a contest between the fleeting stag and the fierce hounds that pursue it, eager for its blood. When pursued, the stag invariably makes for water. There it can give a good account of itself, there also even the best trained hounds may lose the scent.

The Duke of Beaufort, in his book on Hunting, says: 'As all deer will take water "or soil," as it is technically termed, as often as opportunity occurs, the hound must be able to hunt on a cold scent. When a stag "takes soil," the pack must be divided and cast up or down, as the case may be, both banks of the river or stream' (*Hunting*, p. 49). Even the hounds have to be specially treated in view of this tendency on the part of the hunted stag. The same authority says: 'As the climate of Exmoor is very severe during the winter and spring, and as the habit of the deer to "take soil" at all seasons of the year is universal, and entails upon the hounds frequent immersion, the temperature of the kennel lodging-room may be raised by artificial means.' And in a note he shows the precautions that must be taken lest this system produce rheumatism in the hounds. Both in hunting, and in training the hounds, the tendency of the stag to desire the water brooks is never lost sight of.

The conduct of the hunted stag supplies the necessary explanation of the thrilling words and the touching sentiment of the Psalm.

The Psalmist, like the hunted stag, is pursued by his enemies; he mourns because of their oppression. He is driven to the land of Jordan and the Hermons, and to the mountain of Mizar, and as he is pursued his soul panteth after God, even 'as the hart panteth after the water brooks.'

GEORGE R. MACPHAIL.

Dundee.

'Why callest thou me good?'

THE question is one of the more difficult of Christ's sayings. The young ruler who draws it forth is by some regarded as betraying lack of modesty and in need of a snub: 'It isn't for *you* to call *me* good.' Others, again, see in the words a disclaimer on Christ's part of any moral divinity equal with God's. Towards adequate interpreta-

tion we must not ignore the *young man's grief* and *Christ's love of him*. Here, as in so many Gospel incidents, *atmosphere* means much. The young ruler was evidently a close student of the Law; and a keeper of the commandments, blameless. And as such he was too earnest, generous, spiritual-minded to be quite satisfied with the result. The idealism awaked by the Law was not met by even its strict observance: he had a residuum of aspiration which prompted him to inquire after the latest doctrine of the most recent rabbi. Hence his coming to Christ—as a peripatetic pupil seeking the latest knowledge. The maxim of the Rabbis held full sway over his mind—'there is nothing good but the Law.' Christ had to fling him out of that groove, and suggest a goodness higher than the goodness of the Law—namely, God's goodness. He succeeds to perfection. 'Thou callest me good—you are judging from the point of view of the Law—you are saying what you would say to any rabbi. I am not good in that sense. I am good in a better sense. There is none good but God: the goodness I have is God's goodness. *What it is* you have to learn. To learn it, become my disciple, *i.e.* sell all and follow me.' The success of Christ is evident in the grief of the youth, as Browning says:

> Irks Care the crop-full bird?
> Frets Doubt the maw-crammed beast?

A. S. MARTIN.

Aberdeen.

The Prophet's Profit (1 Sam. ix. 7).

A PUN seems to lurk amidst some terms used in 1 S 9^{7-9}; not mere word play, of the kind so often found in the Old Testament—solemn and sententious,—but a pun in the more modern sense. The writer seems to have felt a joke hovering about, and to have refrained from definitely using it. If this surmise is wrong, there is at least a coincidence which may be worth noting.

Saul's servant suggests an application to a local clairvoyant. Saul objects that they have nothing with them which they might offer as a fee. He asks, 'What shall we bring to (*nābhî*) the man? . . . There is not a present to bring to (*hābhî*) the man of God.' Then after telling how the servant produces a franc piece for the fee, the historian (or more probably a later redactor) adds: . . . 'He who is nowadays called the Prophet (*nābhî*) used to be called in olden times the Clairvoyant.'

The spelling and pronunciation of 'shall we bring' and 'Prophet' are identical (נָבִיא, *nābhî*); and 'to bring' differs by one consonant only (הָבִיא, *hābhî*).

What a chance was missed here! 'How shall we make the Prophet profit?'

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

King's College, London.

John xiv. 1.

I.

I WAS much interested in the article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of November, p. 68, on St. John 14^{1}, πιστεύετε, κ.τ.λ. I notice the Peschito renders πιστεύετε each time by ܗܝܡܢܘ, which is undoubtedly imperative.

Alford in his Commentary has the following note: 'πιστεύετε both times is imperative. . . . The discourse presupposes a want of belief in God in its full and true sense, as begetting *trust* in Him.' He cites Cyril, Euthalius, Augustine, Hilary, and others, as rendering it imperative.

Stier (*Words of Jesus*) says, 'A double positive imperative is alone suitable.' See his note on this verse.

I have a New Testament in Hebrew which renders πιστεύετε each time by הַאֲמִינוּ, which word is used in 2 Ch 20^{20}, LXX.

W. S. WALFORD.

Monk Sherborne.

II.

ON the translation of Jn 14^{1}—πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε—'Believe in God, and ye believe in me,' perhaps you will allow me to add a brief note calling attention to the fact that exactly the same construction of imperative and indicative occurs immediately afterwards (Jn 14^{8}), where the Apostle Philip says, δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν—'Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.'

In this case the construction and meaning are unmistakable, for the Aorist imperative is used. But in the first verse the use of the Aorist πιστεύσατε would hardly be suitable, since it is the *continuity* of their belief in God that is essential. 'Whatever happens, amid the horrors

of to-morrow, or the desolation of the day after, or the trials of the years to come, however difficult it may be to believe in me,—*go on believing in God*, and ye believe in me.'

Unfortunately I am not acquainted with the Syriac. But I doubt whether the Vulgate is really evidence, since a double translation was one of Jerome's ways of compromising doubtful cases. Thus in the Lord's Prayer we have in Mt 6^{11} *Panem Supersubstantialem*, but in Lk 11^{3} *Panem quotidianum*; so in the present case the question of indicative or imperative may be settled by similar compromise between the clauses. But to me the rendering, 'Believe in God, and ye believe in me,' seems the simplest, as also the noblest and the best.

D. R. Fotheringham.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

'Adam.'

Where does 'Adam' as proper name for the first time occur in the Bible?

Answer:—

1. In the Targum and in the Syriac Version in Gn 1^{27}.
2. In the A.V. on the margin of 2^{15}; in the text, 2^{19}.
3. In the Septuagint, 2^{16}.
4. In the Vulgate, 2^{19}.
5. In the Hebrew text of the Massorites, 2^{20} (without article).
6. In Luther's Bible, $3^{8.\ 9}$.
7. In the R.V., 3^{17}, and margin of 2^{20}.
8. In the translation of Kautzsch, 4^{25}.

Is that not surprising?

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

The Foundation Sacrifice.

Mr. O'Neill's 'Comment' (The Expository Times, October, p. 43), upon the 'note' on the above subject in the June No., p. 389, is of special interest as coming from one who is working in the Foreign Mission field in Manchuria, and also as showing that Dr. Driver's explanation of Jos 6^{26} (whether original, as far as he is concerned, or derived) was anticipated by Hugh Miller in 1854.

But Hugh Miller could only say that the 'language in Jos 6^{26} seems to point to *some* ancient pagan rite of this kind.' He knew of no examples; nor, apparently, did Professor Robertson Smith, spite of his encyclopædic learning, for, in the *Religion of the Semites*, p. 454, ed. 1907, he merely refers to the passage as forbidding the rebuilding of a city under the Kherem, *i.e.*, banned, devoted, consecrated, accursed; nor does Mr. O'Neill.

But students of Professor Tylor know that they have only to go to his great work *Primitive Culture* to find the examples required—some similar to the 'sun-burnt herd-boy's' story told to Hugh Miller. I will mention a few.

'There is current in Scotland the belief that the Picts, to whom local legend attributes buildings of prehistoric antiquity, bathed their foundation-stones with human blood; and legend even tells that St. Columba found it necessary to bury St. Oran alive beneath the foundation of his monastery, in order to propitiate the spirits of the soil who demolished by night what was built during the day. So late as 1843, in Germany, when a new bridge was built at Halle, a notion was abroad among the people that a child was wanted to be built into the foundation. These ideas of church or wall or bridge wanting human blood or an immured victim to make the foundation steadfast, are not only widespread in European folk-lore, but local chronicle or tradition asserts them as matter of historical fact in district after district.' Professor Tylor then quotes instances from Thuringia, from Servia, from Germany and Denmark and modern Greece, and our own legend of Vortigern, who could not finish his tower till the foundation-stone was wetted with the blood of a child born of a mother without a father.

He then goes on to give present-day pagan examples, such as Hugh Miller suspected, from Africa, as in Galam a boy and girl used to be buried before the great gate of the city to make it impregnable, from Polynesia, from Borneo, Burmah, and even from Japan. And he concludes: 'It is thus plain that hideous rites, of which Europe has scarcely kept up more than the dim memory, have held fast their ancient practice and meaning in Africa, Polynesia, and Asia, among races who represent in grade, if not in chronology, earlier stages of civilization' (*Primitive Culture*, vol. i. pp. 104–108).

H. J. Dukinfield Astley.

East Rudham, Norfolk.

Entre Nous.

Professor Sanday.

On the 13th of October the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford was presented by some friends with a portrait of himself. In reply to the Vice-Chancellor, who made the presentation, Dr. Sanday said—

'When, upon a certain memorable day, I saw the Vice-Chancellor threading his way through the crowd at Carfax, and by his side my noble friend Robert Bridges in full Sunday costume, and just behind Walter Moberly in cap and gown, I little guessed what it all meant: I little guessed that they were in search of *me*, and still less that it was the outcome of a conspiracy on the part of my friends to present me with my picture. However, now it is an accomplished fact. Through the skill of Mr. Campbell Taylor the picture actually stands before you, and it is to be an heirloom in my house. I will ask for your kindly judgment of it. My brother, who is something of an artist, and can enter into the difficulties of an artist, thinks that there is much merit in it. One thing has been borne in upon me in the process of sitting, viz. that hirsute people have a quite unfair advantage in these matters. They are much easier to paint, and to paint effectively. I hope you will kindly make full allowance for this. Well, there it is. And I confess that, now it is done, there is something pleasant in the feeling, *non omnis moriar*, when the time comes, not all of me will be laid under the sod. There is a certain pleasantness in this; but what is still more pleasant—I may say far more pleasant—is that one's friends should wish that some permanent record of one should survive. This is all the more grateful in proportion as one has little hope of any other kind of immortality—I mean, of course, earthly immortality. I look about in vain for what Henry Vaughan called "bright shoots of everlastingness" in any other than a purely celestial sense.

'What is there in anything of mine that should really enjoy more than a very ephemeral life? I am not a scholar, where a scholar comes. I am not an able man, where an able man comes. I am certainly not a good writer, where a good writer comes. I consider that a good writer is one who can write pointedly and well about any subject with which he has a fair acquaintance, and at any time. I am very far from satisfying these conditions. I doubt if even my intimate friends know what an amount of trouble it has cost me to make many of my writings as passable as they are. Very often it is only by some happy conjunction of fate, by some kind providence, that they will bear inspection at all. If there is one thing that I can say for myself, it is only this, that I don't spare rough copies. And I owe not a little to those good friends who have been willing to look over proofs for me and give me the benefit of their criticisms. Perhaps the best that could be claimed for me would be a certain rightness of aim. Or "rightness" may be too strong a word. Of course I am criticised, both on the right hand and on the left. But that does not much move me. It may be the case that I see rather further, in one direction, than my critics on the right, and in another, than my critics on the left. In any case I have a strong feeling that, whether I am right or wrong, it has been a good thing that there should be somebody to take the kind of line I have taken.

'I wonder if I may be allowed to say just a word or two about some of my books—such of them as may be considered to count on an occasion like this? First there are the two youthful productions, written while I was more or less engaged in parish work, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1872, and *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876. I am not ashamed of these, though the earlier book would be very much out of date at the present time, and the latter was concerned with a passing controversy. I have forgotten very much what there is in this second book, but I suspect that it would be found to contain the germ of most that I have been able to offer in the way of critical method ever since. I am afraid there is very little to show for the Durham period, 1876–1883: I was chiefly engaged in slowly building up the material which took shape later. I am sorry for it—and chiefly sorry because I am afraid that it is disappointing and holding in suspense the hopes of my friends at the present time—but all my building-up is really slow; it is a necessity for me to go over ground several times before I can produce a tolerable result.

'When I was elected to the Ireland Chair, and through the kindness of Exeter College I was enabled to come back to Oxford, there falls in the early period of my tenure what is, I am afraid, the only work of mine that can be called strictly exploratory and scientific, my contribution to *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, Part II. 1886, and an essay on "The Cheltenham List of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament and of the Writings of Cyprian" in *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii. 1891. I believe that Dr. Hort already knew all, or very nearly all, that I made out about the Old Latin Texts, but to me it came as a discovery; and there was, perhaps, something of discovery in the treatment of the groupings in the MSS of the writings of Cyprian. On both points my dear friend Cuthbert Turner has since put the fine edge that he puts upon everything, and Freiherr Hans von Soden, son of the well-known Professor Freiherr Hermann von Soden, has treated the whole subject on an exhaustive scale. Within the last few weeks the same writer has also (if I may put it so) built upon our foundations in reconstructing the African Text; and in this he has rather anticipated what some of us were doing here.

'The little book *Oracles of God*, 1891, was a forerunner of the Bampton Lectures on *Inspiration*, 1893. The lectures were written during illness and convalescence and under considerable pressure —only through the indulgence of my college could they have been written at all—and, though they still enjoy a certain life for want of something better, they are not all that I could have wished. They are, for one thing, rather more eloquent than I like. Perhaps I may say that I have returned to the subject—I hope for the last time, or substantially the last time—because I feel that there is still something perhaps to be added another day—in the article "Bible" in the forthcoming volume of Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

'The art., or supplemental art., "Gospels," in the second edition of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1893, was a first instalment of study on the Synoptic Gospels. But the principal product of the latter half of my Ireland tenure was my share in the *Commentary on Romans*, 1895. I hope it will not be forgotten, as it does sometimes seem to be forgotten, that only half the book, and half of such credit as belongs to it, is mine. I am thankful that my part is not worse than it is; but it must not be supposed that I am really satisfied with it, because the latest editions have been unchanged. But to rewrite the book as it ought to be rewritten would be too large a task along with the others that I have on hand. This book, like everything else, was a long time in taking shape; for it, too, had what may be called an infantile forerunner in the little commentary for English readers in Bishop Ellicott's series published in 1878. I confess that it was a pleasure to me to see that the Theological Faculty of the University of Göttingen, when they gave me the degree of D.D. the other day, laid stress on the illustrations from Jewish sources (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha) in the commentary: such illustrations are common now, but we were rather in front of the fashion at the time when the book appeared.

'While I am on the subject I would ask leave to say just a word with reference to some remarks which lately fell from the Vice-Chancellor in his most interesting and illuminating essay on Matthew Arnold. I would venture, with all deference, to estimate rather more highly the value of that portion of Matthew Arnold's writings which dealt with religion. At least in my own case I am conscious of a very great debt to him, and especially in connexion with this book on the Romans. The defects in his treatment of religious subjects are obvious, but they can be put aside. The aspects of it which took hold of me were his unfailing freshness, his constant aiming at reality—the lesson of always trying to write "with the eye upon the object," the real religious experience, and not only what has been said about it—his genuine delight in all good things—the good things of the spirit as well as of the imagination—his frequent felicities of expression, and, in a word, the total absence of anything that was only professional and conventional. Matthew Arnold was, in fact, a conspicuous example of that lay theology which is to me very attractive.

'After my settlement at Christ Church there followed a little group of smaller writings, which I only mention because of the evidence they show of a new influence in my life, that of my never-to-be-forgotten friend, Robert Moberly. He opened my eyes to things that I had not seen before. There has never been a year that I have not constantly lamented his loss; and, so far as my

work is concerned, I think I most of all lament it now. In 1899 was published the most considerable of my contributions to Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, the art. "Jesus Christ," since reprinted under the title, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*. This is far short of what it might have been when it was written, and very far short of what such an article should be at the present time; and yet it is perhaps as good, and even somewhat better than I could have expected to make it. Since the date of its appearance I have had definitely before me the larger work that I have undertaken on the same subject. But I am sorry to say that there is as yet little actually on paper that is likely to stand in the ultimate composition of the book. At the same time I do not honestly think that I could very well have done otherwise than I have done. I will explain in a moment why. It is due to defects of mental constitution of which I had to take account. I found it necessary to attack the work to some extent piecemeal, by a succession of smaller volumes, for the most part occasional in their character, but all of them subsidiary to the main object. First there was *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 1903, which soon died a natural death, as it deserved to die; it has, however, I hope, been a considerable help to me. Then followed the New York Lectures on the Fourth Gospel, 1905. These were written under great difficulties in my *annus funestus*, 1904; and I hope this may be taken as some little palliation of their faults. In 1907 there was the rather composite book, *Recent Research on the Life of Christ*, which was again only a stage—and a temporary stage—on the road. I am afraid there is still one more volume of the kind—but I hope only one—to come, to be based upon the course of public lectures which I am to begin on Friday. I should warn you that they will be very tentative; but the experiment was one that had to be made. I shall try to improve the lectures all I can in the process of production. This will then leave me face to face with the one main object of the rest of my days.

'I must prepare you for the possibility that it may never come to anything. Whether it does will depend in part on the length of days allotted to me. I need not say—you will guess only too well—that I am constantly staggered at the magnitude of the task before me. And yet I have a kind of feeling, an "Ahnung" as the Germans would call it, that—in spite of all the thousand things that may be said and felt to the contrary—it may perhaps lie in the books of heaven that I am to finish my task. I believe, with Hamlet and the Gospels, that "there is a special providence in the fall of a sparrow." I am not sure that this is not the most intense of all my beliefs. And if there have been any special providences in my life—and I am sure that it has been full of them—I cannot help thinking that they point in the direction of its being finished. In particular, I cannot suppress the surmise that, doubtless amongst many other good purposes that take effect in another world as well as in this, the year 1904 was sent to me specially in order that I might be less unfit to write what I have undertaken to write.

'I said a moment ago that I would explain why some things are necessary for me that would not be necessary for many other people. The chief reason among them is very simple—just plain shortness of brains. It is a secret—perhaps not a secret—that I know that I have told some of my friends before. I will undertake to say that my head is the smallest man's head in this room. Most hats go down over my ears. And the consequence is that the head will simply not hold as much at a time as it ought to do. I can't trust my memory. Data are not present to my mind with the clearness and precision that I could wish. And the formative processes are often sluggish. The fact is that I was made in most respects for small tasks, and I have undertaken a big one; there is the whole problem in a nutshell.

'And, as you have listened to me so long, I will ask you of your goodness to have patience with me for a few moments longer. What for others is matter of choice is no choice with me. I must husband my resources. I must concentrate. I must simplify life all I can—do you know, I can't help suspecting that if more of us were to try to simplify life it would be all the better for us. It seems to me that the modern world is like a man struggling with his portmanteau: he sits upon it, and stamps upon it, but the lock won't go to. We try to cram into life more than it will hold. However this may apply or not to others, it certainly applies to me. Therefore, I very much hope that my friends will forgive me if I continue to do, as since the year 1904 I have done—I mean,

drop quietly out of general society, and especially out of evening entertainments of all kinds. I hope my friends will not misunderstand me or think me ungrateful. I am really very much the reverse; I am brimming over with gratitude to my friends every day and every hour. But, to say the plain truth, the gaiety of nations loses nothing by the loss of me. I am really almost always used up and good for nothing at that end of the day. If all parties were by law held at seven o'clock in the morning there might be a severer conflict of claims. Perhaps such a law may come in as a sequel to the Daylight Saving Bill. If my friends will kindly let me go on as I am, it will certainly be (as it has been) much better for my health, and much better for my work. With this last petition I will close, and with the expression of my deepest and sincerest thanks.'

Driver's Genesis.

Messrs. Methuen have published *Additions and Corrections in the Seventh Edition of the Book of Genesis*, by S. R. Driver, D.D. (1s.). The pamphlet runs to thirty-six pages of close-set type, and there is not a lost line or a wasted word. The new notes of most importance are two of considerable length on the Egyptian and Babylonian Chronology, in which Professor Driver explains the grounds of the differences between different systems, and states those most recently accepted. There is a new date for Hammurabi, and here and there a reference to Professor Orr. But the pamphlet must be set beside the Commentary and used along with it.

Foi et Vie.

The Editors and Publishers of *Foi et Vie* are to be heartily congratulated on the successful issue on October 16th of the special number of their interesting magazine. They have made it a worthy souvenir of the fourth Centenary of the birth of Calvin. It is profusely illustrated. The letterpress contains articles on various aspects of Calvin's life, teaching, and character which should not be neglected by any student of the great Reformer. The price is 1 franc 50 (postage, 25 centimes). Paris: 48 Rue de Lille.

The Son of the Heavenly Chief.

The story of William Duncan of Metlakahtla is told by John W. Arctander, LL.D., of the Minneapolis Bar; and it is published by Messrs. Revell under the title of *The Apostle of Alaska* (5s. net). It is a large book, plentifully illustrated; and it is just as good for the study of religion as it is for the romance of missions.

Think, for example, of the story of the White Christ. 'Mrs. Booth, a full-blooded Tsimshean at Metlakahtla, told Mr. Duncan that her mother had related to her, when a little girl, the following:

'"At first it was entirely dark. There was no light in the world. The people could see nothing, but were groping around in a continual night. Then the son of the Heavenly Chief came down to earth, and the people complained to him that it was so dark. He said he would help them, and then light came. He travelled around for a long time, and helped the people in their trouble. He was so kind and good, and the people loved him very much."'

There are other legends of like effect, but more drawn out and circumstantial. Where did they come from? All that the author can say about it is that it hardly seems possible for the Tsimsheans to have been able thus to picture the Man of Galilee, just as He wandered about on earth, if those who first drew the picture had not seen Him with their own eyes, or received their information from some one who had.

I.H.S.

What is the meaning of the monogram I.H.S.? Any one you ask will answer Jesus Hominum Salvator. But that is not the original meaning. It is originally a Greek symbol, and the letters are Greek. They are the first three letters of the name Jesus, and were used as a common abbreviation of the name; just as the name Christ was often written with its first two letters only, and then turned into the familiar monogram ☧.

All this useful lore and very much more, and some of it more useful, will be found in *The Romance of Symbolism*, by Sidney Heath (Griffiths; 7s. 6d. net).

S. D. Gordon.

The Gordons are a great clan. There is a newspaper published in the capital of the Gordon country which for many weeks has been giving

columns of close print to the unravelling of their ramifications. But now that they have settled so freely throughout America, and have taken to the writing of so many books, who is sufficient to keep them separate? Let us fix our minds on one. And let it be the Rev. S. D. Gordon, the author of *Quiet Talks.*

The Rev. S. D. Gordon is the author of *Quiet Talks on Power*, *Quiet Talks on Prayer*, and *Quiet Talks on Service.* Last of all, co-operating with Mrs. Gordon, he is the author of *Quiet Talks on Home Ideals* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net).

What are the topics treated in *Home Ideals*? They are (1) the Ideals themselves, which are called God's tuning-forks, to keep the music of life up to concert pitch; (2) the Finest Friendship, which is called the rhythmic living of two together; (3) Home, where love reigns and trains; (4) the Finest Friendship's Finest Fruit, called the innermost holy of holies; (5) Father and Mother, God's fellow-creators; (6) the Babe, a fresh act of God; (7) Heredity, the influences that go before; (8) Training, the influences that come after.

The ideas are not ordinary, nor is the language commonplace. Under Heredity something worth saying is said about pre-natal prayer—the prayer of Hannah and the good it did to Samuel, the prayer of any mother and the good it does. And this poem is quoted—

> Vaguely through my blood it moved,
> Somewhat as a dream;
> Then at times more sharply stirred
> In that pulsing stream.
>
> By and by it sought to rise
> Upward as on wings;
> Save for it, my heart had missed
> Touch with higher things.
>
> Yea, and had it not been there
> In my hour of need,
> I had not withdrawn my hand
> From a slavish deed.
>
> Ah, the gifts that one at birth
> From his mother gains!
> This for me,—that prayer was wrought
> Subtly in my veins.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. A. Oswald Williams, Guilden Morden Vicarage, and the Rev. J. M. Macphail, M.D., Bambah, India, to each of whom a copy of Dykes's *Christian Minister* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for January must be received by the 1st of December. The text is Rev 14^{13}.

The Great Text for February is Rev 20^{12}—'And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works.' A copy of Law's *Tests of Life* or Newton Clarke's *Doctrine of God* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Rev 21^{1}—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more.' A copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, or Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Forrest's *Christ of History and of Experience*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for April is Rev 21^{5}—'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Holborn's *Architectures of European Religions*, or Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for May is Rev 21^{27}—'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, or of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor Swete has edited another volume of Cambridge Essays. The former was a volume of Theological essays; this volume is Biblical. Its full title is *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day* (Macmillan; 12s. net).

The authors of the essays are without exception men of mark. There are no surprises out of the unknown. The topics treated of are also within the range of the expected. Yet there is a surprise in the book. The surprise is its agnosticism. And the greatness of the surprise is that not one or two of the writers, but that all the writers, without exception, are agnostics.

We do not use the word 'agnostic' with the Huxley meaning. We do not suggest that these Cambridge scholars have any doubt about the existence of God; or for a moment hesitate to affirm that He is a God with whom they have to do. They know both that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Their agnosticism is scientific. It is a restraint, not upon their profession of faith, but upon their profession of knowledge. Much as they are absolutely sure of in the region of the Spirit, in the region of historical affirmation they have learned one and all to hold their hand.

This is a new note of English scholarship. The note was struck in Oxford, but Cambridge has given it united voice. It is partly conscious. It is a protest against the raging dogmatism of some recent Continental scholarship, a dogmatism that has been all the more dogmatic that it has mainly been denial. But it is chiefly quite unconscious. It has arisen more than anything else from recognizing the amount of mischief that has been done in the study of the Bible from the indiscriminate use of the argument from silence.

One of the strangest uses of the argument from silence ever made, was made quite recently by a writer who was arguing against the sinlessness of our Lord. We have no records of the first thirty years of His life, *therefore* we may say that He was not sinless. That was the argument. The writer admitted that He was sinless so far as the records exist. These Cambridge essayists do not argue from the unknown *against* the known; they do not argue from the unknown at all. One and all they say what they know, and hold their hand. And yet, perhaps, none of them puts quite so much restraint upon himself as does Mr. C. H. W. Johns, the Master of St. Catharine's College.

Mr. Johns has written an essay on 'The Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament.' Now, we all desire to know what influence the Babylonian Mythology has had

upon the Old Testament. We desire this for apologetic reasons, and for scientific reasons, and for the mere sake of knowing. For is not man the animal that would like to know? And if any one, in Cambridge or out of it, can tell us, it is the Master of St. Catharine's College.

But Mr. JOHNS does not tell us. The similarity between the myths of the early chapters of Genesis and the myths of Babylon is notorious. But what is similarity? The Professor of Zend Philology in Oxford, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for last month, showed us two nations making the discovery of the same striking religious conceptions side by side and independently. So it is at least possible, says Mr. JOHNS, that the striking resemblances between the Flood story of the Babylonians and the Flood story of the Hebrews are due to parallel and independent development. That is the first theory.

But mythology is so widespread, it is such a *human* thing, that independent development is almost out of the question. There is no need, says Mr. JOHNS, to suggest independence, nor is there any necessity to go directly to Babylonian sources in order to account for the Hebrews having a Deluge story or a cosmogony. The myth of the Deluge is so ancient and so widespread that all we have to do is to carry both back to some common Semitic ancestor. That is the second theory.

Mr. JOHNS calls this 'a comfortable doctrine.' He means, apparently, that it has been the refuge of the believer in Inspiration. Given an original myth, it is always possible and may be easy to show how the Babylonians would let it develop on its superstitious side, and how the Hebrews would be guided to give it real religious value. But Mr. JOHNS counts it but a temporary resting-place. For it is after all a myth.

And there is no doubt, as Mr. JOHNS again reminds us, that mythology in the Bible is to most of us 'a very shocking idea.' But why is it shocking? Because by a 'myth' we mean such a story as in our early classical studies we read and were shocked at in connexion with the gods of Greece and Rome. Mr. JOHNS feels the offence himself. He cannot quite rid himself of certain unbecoming recollections. And he wishes some one would invent another word.

But until the new word comes, it is well to understand what the old word really means. It is an attempt to put a scientific hypothesis into pre-scientific language. Say that an eclipse has taken place: what is the cause of it? The pre-scientific scientist says that a dragon has devoured the sun.

Now it is quite possible that the original inventor of that hypothesis believed that a dragon did actually devour the sun. In that case he would be a scientific observer pure and simple, with a scientific hypothesis very much at fault. But it is also possible that he simply used metaphorical language because he had nothing else to convey his meaning with. 'Some peoples,' says Mr. JOHNS, 'can only express the idea of conquering another folk by the words "we eat them up." They are not therefore to be regarded as cannibals. The Babylonian talked of "eating" a field when he meant enjoying the usufruct of it.'

Take the case of the Chaos. The Babylonians spoke of a certain monster Tiamat. But Tiamat may be nothing whatever but water, and the theory that all was once water is as really scientific, says Mr. JOHNS, as the opinion that all was once gaseous matter. Now, water in the form of an ocean was such a restless, fierce monster to early man that to speak of it as a dragon was natural. It does not follow, therefore, that the Babylonian myth is so different from the Hebrew explanation. It may be a matter of more or less mythological language. In any case, it does not follow that we need be desperately alarmed at the presence of a myth in the Old Testament.

Well, as we have said, Mr. JOHNS is agnostic.

He makes many pleasant suggestions; he does not come to many definite conclusions. But we think we shall not misrepresent him if we say that his own theory of the influence of Babylonian mythology upon the Old Testament is none of these. There is a third theory. Before stating it, we may just notice a possible fourth. It is the theory that whatever Babylonianism there is in the Old Testament came into it at and after the Captivity. For that theory Mr. JOHNS seems to have little liking.

The third theory is that the Hebrew narratives of the Creation, the Flood, and the rest, are fragments of one stream of tradition, and the Babylonian myths are fragments of another. Besides that Babylonian version with which the narratives in the Bible are usually compared, there is another Babylonian version, which differs as much from the well-known version as that does from the Old Testament.

This does not mean that all three must be carried back to one Semitic original. All three may be independent. And all three may go back to an original beyond even the Semitic, an original that is as far back as to be for all practical purposes universal.

And thus are we led to a much more momentous remark, in making which we hope again that we do not misrepresent Mr. JOHNS. It is the remark that Mr. JOHNS sees nothing unique about the Hebrew religion which would exempt it from the operation of laws admitted to work in the case of other religions.

A history of the opposition to the infallibility of the Pope, urged by Roman Catholics themselves, has been written by the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford. The book is noticed on another page.

Is there any foundation in Scripture for the doctrine of infallibility? The Ultramontane says there is. Its foundation is found in the words of our Lord to Peter: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren' (Lk 22^{32}). Mr. SPARROW SIMPSON discusses the Roman interpretation of that passage.

The passage is worth discussion for its own sake. It is worth more than discussion, it is worth appropriation. Spoken originally to Peter by the Christ about to suffer, it may well be taken as spoken now by the risen Christ to each of us. But if it is the foundation of the dogma of papal infallibility it assumes a new importance. It has now an importance that is not only experimental, but also historical. What, then, is the Roman Catholic interpretation of this passage?

It consists of four statements. First, Christ here confers on Peter an exclusive prerogative, on the ground of Peter's superior position. Secondly, this prerogative is infallible insight. Thirdly, he was thereby enabled to give infallible instructions to his brethren. Fourthly, this prerogative extends to all Peter's successors, and to none but those—the prerogative being as exclusive in its range as it was in its origin. Mr. SIMPSON considers the text under four heads also. His heads are Christ's Prayer; Peter's Faith; Peter's Brethren; and Peter's Successors.

He considers first Christ's Prayer—'I have prayed for thee.' He says it is certainly an exclusive prayer. Satan hath desired to have *you*, collectively; but I have prayed for *thee*, St. Peter, individually. Christ here prays for the one: for the others, on this occasion, He does not pray. Does not this, then, imply the superiority of the individual so distinguished? Mr. SIMPSON says it does not. The exclusive petition may imply the greater superiority of the person prayed for; it may equally well imply his greater need. Mr. SIMPSON believes that if we consider the character of Peter and the nature of the coming trial we shall

come to the conclusion that on this occasion particular prayer meant particular need of prayer.

And there is another thing about the prayer. If it was exclusive, it was also conditional. No doubt it is true that whatever Christ prays for comes to pass. Is it not written, 'I know that thou hearest me always'? 'But,' says Mr. SIMPSON,—and it is right well worth saying,—'the effectiveness of Christ's prayers must take into account our human independence. To say that the prayer of Christ must necessarily realize its design, is really to reduce mankind to a mechanism upon which the Spirit plays.' The prayer for Peter is an offer of sufficient grace, but Peter must yield his will to the grace that is offered.

The next thing is Peter's Faith—'That thy faith fail not.' Now there is no difficulty in understanding what is meant here by Peter's faith, and there is no serious difficulty in understanding what is meant by his faith failing. His faith is not an intellectual assent to a number of propositions—the suggestion is itself preposterous. It is a moral relation to a Person. It is devotion to Christ Himself, and it calls not only upon the intellect, but also upon the affections and the will.

What happens, then, to a man's faith when it is said to fail? It suffers an eclipse. The Greek word here translated 'fail' is sometimes used to describe an eclipse. And to the primitive imagination an eclipse suggested death, much as we talk of the dying day. 'Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail'—the meaning is that they shall not come to an end or cease to be.

Was Christ's prayer answered? Did Peter's faith cease to be? It did not cease to be for ever. We may say, indeed, that that faith in Christ which lay within the heart of Peter, that personal devotion to Christ which was his faith, did not cease to be even for a single moment. But certainly its outward expression suffered an eclipse. And that is most unfortunate for the argument of the Roman theologian, who uses Peter's experience to prove his infallibility. For infallibility is nothing if it is not infallibility in expression. So far as the doctrine of infallibility is concerned, it does not matter what Peter or his successors believe in their hearts. The infallibility must belong to their utterance. Peter's utterance was far from infallible when he said, 'I know not the man.'

The third thing is the strengthening of Peter's Brethren—'when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.' Now to strengthen is to give support. The word is employed by St. Paul. To the Romans he says, 'I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be *established*' (Ro 1^{11}). He sends Timothy to the Thessalonians, 'to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith' (1 Th 3^{2}). St. Peter uses the word also. He desires that God would 'stablish, strengthen, settle' the Christian (1 P 5^{10}); and he says that Christians are 'established in the present truth' (2 P 1^{12}). And St. John uses the word: 'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die' (Rev 3^{2}).

These passages show that to strengthen one's brethren is to lend them moral support. And it may be moral support of almost any kind. It may be the support of a man who has received richly of grace divine, or of one who has entered largely into a knowledge of the truth. But where is the suggestion made that a man must be infallible before he can strengthen his brethren? Is there any one who would have repudiated infallibility, even in the days that were to follow, more emphatically than Peter himself? Nay, the history tells us very plainly that Peter could fail to strengthen his brethren even in the ordinary way of affording them moral support. Or at least, if Peter was infallible when that sharp contention took place at Antioch between him and Paul, what shall we then say about the Apostle Paul?

The last point is about Peter's Successors. But

the text fails us here. Our Lord does not mention successors. He does not mention them even by implication. Peter's successors may be read into Christ's words; they cannot be read out of them.

But if the words 'strengthen thy brethren' are claimed for Peter's successors, then the words 'when thou art converted' must belong to them also. Bellarmin saw this, and was disturbed by it. He suggested that 'converted' must not be understood as moral renovation and repentance, but as an adverb equivalent to 'in turn,' as if the passage ran: 'I have strengthened thee, do thou in turn strengthen thy brethren.' But when Bellarmin gave that interpretation, says Mr. SPARROW SIMPSON, he gave up the case.

About a year ago an article appeared in the *Hibbert Journal* with the title of 'Jesus or Christ?' It was not a valuable article. It would probably not have been written if its author had been better educated. The chance that it would be accepted by any editor was one in a hundred. Yet that one chance came to it. It was accepted by the editor of the *Hibbert Journal*. It was printed, and appeared in the issue of that journal for January 1909.

It was a bad article, and it was badly printed. Professor SCHMIEDEL's 'Nine Foundation Pillars,' which he has had so much trouble in getting to stand, suffered the worst shipwreck that has yet befallen them. The sentence appeared in this form: 'Following it [criticism], we pass through narrowing areas of admissible statement, and, guided by Dr. SCHMIEDEL's "pillar," pass ages [for 'passages'], till we reach the position of Professor KHALTOFF [for 'KALTHOFF'], from which the figure of the historic Jesus has completely vanished.'[1]

[1] This sentence in the amended edition of the article published at the end of this volume now reads: 'Following it, we pass along narrowing areas of admissible statement, through the textual territory marked by Dr. SCHMIEDEL's "pillar" passages, till we reach the position of KALTHOFF, from which the figure of the historic Jesus has completely vanished.'

Yet the editor tells us that within a week of the publication of the article, 'replies and criticisms, eulogies and condemnations, began to pour in from all quarters.' The statement is not complimentary to the readers of the *Hibbert Journal*. The article was not worth condemnation.

But whatever he thought of the article, the idea came to the editor that a certain number of men should be invited to express themselves on the alternative, 'Jesus *or* Christ?' which the title of the article suggested. Seventeen men responded to his invitation. Their contributions, together with an amended edition of the original article, have been issued as a volume. Its title is still *Jesus or Christ?* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net).

Below the title of the article in the *Hibbert Journal* the author was named Rev. R. ROBERTS, and described as 'Congregational Minister.' But Dr. Horton promptly replied that the Rev. R. ROBERTS had not been a Congregational minister for eleven years. From the article itself it was evident that he was a Unitarian. The title 'Jesus or Christ?' was cleverly chosen to express the difference between Unitarians and Trinitarians. And by that difference the writers of the papers in the volume must be distinguished. They are not representative. The editor, being himself a Unitarian, may be excused for giving a preponderance to Unitarians. But the proportion of two to one is excessive. And yet, just because of the preponderance of what the editor would call 'liberal' opinion—the opinion of those to whom Jesus was 'a mere man'—the book is crammed with encouragement.

The title is 'Jesus *or* Christ?' Now Jesus stands for 'this human being,' to use the phrase of Professor WEINEL. And, as we have said, more than two-thirds of the authors of the volume look upon Jesus as 'this human being,' and no more. The

expression which has already been used is 'mere man,' and that expression is familiar now. But Professor Henry JONES, of Glasgow, objects to it. He thinks that it implies 'blasphemy against human nature.' But Professor JONES has forgotten the history of the word 'mere.'

It is one of the first words that Abbott calls attention to in his *Shakespearian Grammar*. 'Mere,' he says 'is unmixed with anything else,' hence, by inference, 'intact,' 'complete'; and the quotation he makes is from *Othello*, II. ii. 3—'The mere perdition of the Turkish fleet,' that is, its complete destruction. Other examples will be found in Murray; to which we may add one from *Robinson Crusoe* (Defoe is curiously fond of the word)—'I went down to my Farm, and became in one half Year, a meer Country Gentleman.'

To say, then, that Jesus was a mere man, is to say that He was not more than a man. It is not to say that He was less. There is here and there in this volume an inclination to suggest that believers in the Divinity of Jesus do not believe in His humanity. But that is not so. They believe, as sincerely as Professor SCHMIEDEL, that He was 'a man in the full sense of the term.' As Professor Percy GARDNER says: 'The Church has insisted on the belief that after all her Master was a "perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting."'

The question is, was He more than man? And it is an important question. Some of the writers in this volume recognize its importance. Says Dr. GARVIE: 'It will be generally recognized that this is probably the most urgent and important question with which the Christian theologian, in seeking to expound and defend the Christian faith, is to-day called to deal.'

Now the way in which the distinction is made between Jesus as man and Jesus as more than man is by the alternative title 'Jesus *or* Christ?' That is plainly the result, whatever may have been the purpose, of the article which opened the discussion. But that is just what the majority of the writers in this volume deny. They accept 'Jesus,' and they accept 'Christ.' They believe that Jesus was a mere man; but to express His mere manhood they claim not only the name 'Jesus,' but also the name 'Christ.'

They do not all do so. Professor SCHMIEDEL, who is perhaps the most uncompromising Unitarian in the list, tells us that he is most particular not to do so. 'I maintain,' he says, 'a clear distinction between the terms "Jesus" and "Christ" in my own practice, and demand that it shall be maintained in the intercourse of theologians with one another.' But the Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL does so. Mr. CAMPBELL says there is no need of the alternative 'Jesus or Christ.' 'For the greatness of Jesus consists in the fact that He has made the word "Christ" a synonym for the best and highest that can truly be called human.' And with that the majority agree.

Here, then, is the first thing to settle. Here is the secret of the interest which the original article has raised. Put the matter plainly as an issue between Unitarian and Trinitarian, and only a small proportion of the readers even of the *Hibbert Journal* would hesitate to take their side. But argue that all that is involved in the word 'Christ' may be saved without passing the bounds of the human, and the argument will be listened to with respect. That is what the majority of the Unitarians who write in this volume see. That is how they argue.

The most beautiful of the papers is the one that has been written by Dr. James DRUMMOND, lately Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. It is the paper of a Unitarian, of that there is no doubt. Manchester College is a Unitarian College; and Dr. DRUMMOND describes himself in his article as a Unitarian. Yet so wholly does Dr. DRUMMOND absorb the title 'Christ' that we should not have known, and we believe no one else would have

known, from the article itself, if the author had not called himself a Unitarian in it, that Dr. DRUMMOND was not a believer in the Divinity of our Lord. So far as we can see, Christ is everything to him that He is to any of us. Take a single sentence: 'There are those who have, through the medium of the New Testament and the traditional life of the purest Christendom, looked into the face of Jesus, and seen there an ideal, a glory which they have felt to be the glory of God, a thought of Divine Sonship, which has changed their whole conception of human nature, and the whole aim of their life; and no criticisms and no shortcomings can alter that supreme fact of spiritual experience.'

The reference is unmistakable. It is Dr. DRUMMOND himself that sees the glory of God in the face of Jesus. And Dr. DRUMMOND does not stand here alone. His is the most charming paper. But the paper of Professor Percy GARDNER is only a degree less charming. Take a rather longer quotation. Professor GARDNER does not describe himself in set words as a Unitarian, but he certainly does not believe in the Deity of Christ. Yet he claims so much of what Professor SCHMIEDEL would strictly reserve for 'Christ,' that he is able to speak in this way.

'Take them as we will,' he says, 'the facts of early Christianity are of a most surprising, unparalleled character. Such facts as it offers are so unusual that no one save a shallow sciolist would be ready with a cut-and-dried explanation of them. There is the astonishing life of the Master, which has impressed many who were not professed Christians with an admiration almost beyond expression. There is the wonderful change which came over the Apostles after the time of the Crucifixion, transforming them from timid and half-appreciative disciples into bold and effective missionaries of the faith. There is the rapid spread of the new doctrine, in the face of bitter hostility and persecution. There is the remarkable ethical similarity between the teaching of Paul and that of his Master, while at the same time in his hands the Christian teaching undergoes a prodigious development, becoming fit, not for an obscure sect of Jews, but for the great cities of the Greek world. These and many other such historic phenomena seem to me to be only explicable by the supposition that a mighty spiritual power of a new kind and of greatly superior force was dawning on the world, a power not easily to be accounted for, yet in all things to be taken into account.'

Now although Dr. DRUMMOND'S and Professor GARDNER'S articles are the most attractive of the Unitarian articles in the volume, and Professor SCHMIEDEL'S is the most unattractive, yet Professor SCHMIEDEL is right, and they are wrong. Of that there is no doubt whatever. They claim the title 'Christ' as belonging to their Unitarianism, but history is wholly against them. Whenever the things of the moral and spiritual life, which have been so winningly described here, are found attached to Christ, they are found associated with belief in His Divinity. Not one of the writers in this volume has discovered a case to the contrary.

It is, in truth, a wholly new attitude to Christ that is taken up by the distinguished men who write in this volume. We have often seen the blessings of Christianity appropriated by those who refuse to call themselves Christians. That is a quite familiar attitude. But here are men to whom Jesus was a mere man, however they may endeavour to escape the edge of that word 'mere,' claiming for themselves all that the Church has obtained from its faith in Jesus Christ as the God-Man; and yet they write as if their claims were legitimate and undeniable.

That claim has to be rejected. There is so much sweet reasonableness in it, and so much goodwill in the men who make it, that some courage may be required from those who withstand it. Yet we must withstand it to the face. For it contradicts the whole history of Christianity. It reduces to impotence that Gospel which is the

power of God unto salvation. And more than that, however these courteous scholars may protest, none the less is it true that it makes both 'Jesus' and 'Christ' names of no particular importance to the world.

It makes 'Jesus' and 'Christ,' we say, names of no particular importance. Professor JONES protests. And we gladly admit that Professor JONES has done his best with that human Jesus whom he has no objection to calling 'Christ.' But what does his effort amount to? Jesus is historical, Christ is ideal. And then his whole endeavour is to reduce the difference between Christ and other men. Take Jesus alone, and we have a man subject to like infirmities (and sins) as we are. Take Jesus Christ together, and we have the ideal man. This ideal man has never yet been seen on earth. But he has been conceived by the heart of man, and he is set up as a standard of encouragement to man's hope.

Professor JONES is strongly opposed to the separation of the one man Christ Jesus from every other man. His words in one place are, 'I venture to say that there is one theory which is fundamentally inimical to every Christian faith—namely, that which separates man from Christ.' And he is right. That is the fundamental heresy. Even a theory of representation is not enough. Professor JONES does well to insist on identification.

But he mistakes altogether the point at which the identification is made. He thinks that the work of Christ consisted in revealing the Fatherhood of God, and as a consequence the sonship of man, and that Christ and man were brought together in that way, both being shown to be sons of God. Who revealed the Father, he does not say clearly. Sometimes he seems to say that Jesus the man of Nazareth did it; sometimes that it was done by the Church under the name of the 'ideal' Christ. But however it was done, this, he says, was the work that Christ came to do. And when you speak of 'conversion,' all you mean is 'the recognition by man of a relationship that existed from the beginning.'

And this is not peculiar to Professor JONES. 'There is no doubt,' says Professor SCHMIEDEL, that his making the conception of God as the Father, which indeed was not new, the central point of his religion, was a fact of the greatest importance.' And Professor BACON, of Yale, makes the sweeping assertion: 'There is nothing further to be said in the name of religion for the guidance of humanity than is implied in the three syllables of Jesus' message: "Our Father." This is the gospel; the rest is commentary.'

But if this is the gospel, how can Professor SCHMIEDEL say it was not new? The gospel was new if it was anything. That it was new was understood to have been the first announcement of it. That it was new was the unwavering delight of every 'individual Christian believer.' We believe as heartily as Professor JONES, or any other, that Christ brought the revelation of God's Fatherhood to men—all that is essential and operative for salvation in it. But whether *that* was 'new' or not we are not greatly concerned to discuss; for it is quite certain that that is not the gospel.

Professor JONES says that Christ 'came to declare the Father.' Where did he find that? Not in the New Testament. In the Gospels we are told that Christ came to call sinners, that He came to seek and to save the lost, that He came to give His life as a ransom; and with that the rest of the Scriptures of the New Testament agree. But where is it said that He came to reveal God's Fatherhood? Being here, He did reveal the Father. But that He *came for that purpose*—that is never said or suggested.

Nor is that ever named in all the history of the Church of Christ as the purpose of the Incarnation. History is as adverse to this modern notion as the New Testament. But here we have only

to make one writer answer another. Professor SCHMIEDEL agrees with the others that the revelation of the Divine Fatherhood is a fact of the greatest importance. 'At the same time,' he proceeds to say, 'we must carefully guard ourselves from attaching a too unqualified value to this conception. We ought not to forget that it is only one image, and that this image does not express everything that we are compelled to include in our thought of God.'

We do not overlook the fact that Professor JONES does go to Scripture for a proof of his statement that Jesus 'came to declare the Father.' But what Scripture? The Parable of the Prodigal Son. And in this he is at one with Professor SCHMIEDEL. The rest have left that parable alone. But how long will it be before all men will understand that that parable, as every other parable, was spoken on a special occasion and for a special purpose? It was spoken to the Pharisees because they complained that He received sinners and ate with them. And it was spoken to show them that God was as willing to receive sinners as they were unwilling. But the method of the reception was not in question, and was not considered. Besides, even if the occasion and meaning of the parable were less obvious than they are, what would become of Theology if a doctrine were held to be proved simply because it seemed to be implied in some particular parable? Does Professor JONES believe that there is a hell where the tongues of wicked men are parched in flames of fire? There is a parable which seems to say so. Does he hold that it is the final word on the subject?

Professor JONES is right in insisting on the identification of Christ with men. But the identification takes place, not because Christ happened to be born into the world as other men, but because He deliberately came into the world to redeem men. And now observe the difference.

In order to identify Christ with men Professor JONES has to deny His uniqueness. And he finds it very difficult to deny it successfully. He does not invite us to look at the facts, whether in Scripture or in the Christian life. He relies on general observation. 'I cannot see,' he says, 'what accession of spiritual power Christianity can have from demonstrating the *unlikeness* of Jesus of Nazareth to other men.' And again, 'By making the relation of Jesus to God unique, the idealizing light which He threw upon human nature through the momentous conception of its affinity to the divine is obscured.'

But even in this way he is unable to exclude the idea of uniqueness wholly. 'I can well believe,' he says, 'that He felt that He stood alone in His mission; and that the revelation had come to Him with a fulness and power with which it came to no other, I do not doubt.' In like manner Professor WEINEL, while denying the uniqueness of the person of Christ, admits that 'we must leave him his own peculiar work, which was to give humanity a new ideal and a new belief in God—the purest ideal and the loftiest belief'—though he immediately thinks it necessary to prove that this is not 'another exaggeration.' And even Professor SCHMIEDEL, most contentedly prosaic of them all, takes alarm at the result of denying Jesus all uniqueness whatever. 'The more the Godhead of Jesus, the miracles, and the sacrificial death are surrendered, the more pressing becomes the demand that his ideas must have been new without qualification, otherwise the value of his life's achievement appears in danger of gradually dwindling towards zero.'

None of this is the uniqueness claimed for Christ by the believer in His Divinity, nor all of this together. But it is good so far as it goes. And it shows how hard a task the modern philosopher has set himself when he attempts to prove that Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, *including* sin.

Including sin. For, of course, the mere man is

sinful. Not one of these Unitarian authors has any doubt about that. How could they? As Professor SCHMIEDEL bluntly puts it, 'If the position that he was man be accepted without reserve, the question, whether he was sinless, takes the following form: Can a man be sinless?' And accordingly the Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL dismisses the matter with an impatient shrug: 'To speak of Him as morally perfect is absurd; to call Him sinless is worse.'

And thus is opened up the whole practical question: How, then, can Jesus Christ be our example? That He is our example is the one great fact which these men rescue from the wreck of historic Christianity. It is their one great consolation prize to a disappointed world. This, according to Professor JONES, is the worth of His life. This, according to Professor SCHMIEDEL, is the value of His death. 'He thereby showed himself willing to champion his cause by suffering martyrdom for its sake, and not merely to proclaim it before the world as a teacher.'

But of what is this Jesus an example? Of intellectual attainment? By no means. Of moral excellence? Not at all. Of religious superiority? Certainly not. In all these things, according to all these writers (with the possible exception of Dr. DRUMMOND) He fell short. It is true that the Church has made an ideal figure of the historical Jesus, and to that figure has attributed everything that we look for in our example. But the historical Jesus is no example. And even the men who adopt the Church's ideal do so with this reservation, that in *some* things He comes short.

Is it answered that an example does not need to be perfect? Professor JONES makes that answer. He says that a life which is not perfect is all the better example. But that is not true. And if Professor JONES were writing again, he would admit that an example, whether of living or of dying, cannot be less than perfect, that in so far as it is not perfect it is not an example.

We do not wish to urge the matter, because the example of Christ is not the gospel. But it is the only gospel which is left for those who surrender the Godhead—it is well to see that, and to say it.

And there is another thing that has to be said. Why is it that these scholars, who cannot free themselves from the fascination of Christ, do not go all the way and, with 'doubting' Thomas, say at last, 'My Lord and my God'? They do not deny the uplift which is found by other men in that 'faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me.' Some of them have even experienced it. Dr. James DRUMMOND has certainly experienced it; and we believe that Professor Percy GARDNER has experienced it also. But when they all see what this faith has done for other men—and, with the possible exception again of Professor SCHMIEDEL, they do all see and acknowledge it—why is it that they themselves stop short of it?

We shall be bold enough to go to a volume of sermons for the answer. There is a volume published this month by a preacher of the name of Henry W. CLARK. In that volume there is a sermon on 'Lost Spiritual Opportunities.' The occasion of it is Thomas, the 'doubting' disciple of our Lord. Mr. CLARK's answer to our question is that, as Thomas 'was not with them' when the rest of the disciples had their experience, he doubted if they had it. His doubt was due to the neglect of being in the way. For—and now let us quote Mr. CLARK—'For the inevitable consequence of practical neglect in the search for Christly communions is a sense of unreality in Christly communions. Whatever of scepticism there was in Thomas was scepticism of this type. Such a revelation of Christ as the other disciples claimed to have received was to him unreal—whatever might be the abstract possibility or impossibility of such a revelation being given—simply because he had cut himself off therefrom. What he had not experienced, what he had prevented himself from experiencing, stood in his thought as a thing that would not and could not befall.'

Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.

By the Rev. P. J. Maclagan, M.A., D.Phil., Swatow.

At the outset it is as well to define our subject. For Taoism offers itself to us in two forms. There is the Taoism of Lao-tsze as set forth in his *Tao Teh King*, and there is the popular Taoism of the present day. When we speak of Taoism as along with Confucianism and Buddhism making up the three religions or doctrines of China, it is this popular Taoism of which we must think. But it is the Taoism of Lao-tsze which is the proper subject of this paper. The two forms of Taoism are, of course, related to each other. One might illustrate the relation between them by the relation between the Christianity of the New Testament and the popular Roman Catholicism of one of the least enlightened Roman Catholic countries. And just as Christianity is more fairly represented by its New Testament form than by its corrupt and semi-paganized sequel, so Taoism in its classic form is to be sought in the book which is ascribed to Lao-tsze rather than in the medley of idolatry and magic which is to-day called Taoism. Our subject, then, is the Taoism of Lao-tsze, and his book the *Tao Teh King*.

In my treatment of this subject I shall not on this occasion begin at the beginning. In writing this paper I had prepared an introduction giving all that can claim to be of historic value in the stories we have of Lao-tsze, and touching on the critical questions that have been raised as to the book that is claimed as his. Critical questions are apt to be dry, and discussion of them tedious. I should have tried to enliven my remarks by introducing specimens of the vagaries of Chinese scholarship and of subjective criticism in that field. I should have asked you to share with me for a moment or two the Lucretian joy of standing on some serene mount of lofty indifference, and surveying, on the darkling plain below, the turmoil of battle, where Legge and Giles and Balfour and Parker and Kingsmill are fighting pretty much each man for his own hand. But, on the whole, you may be glad to have escaped these preliminary matters on which sinologues are still disputing. I shall only say that the generally accepted date of Lao-tsze's birth is 604 B.C., some fifty years before the birth of Confucius. And as to the *Tao Teh King* itself, I feel at liberty, after weighing as well as I can all that I have found written by critics on one side or the other, to treat it as, in the main, the work of Lao-tsze. Even if that be not admitted, it is at least the authority for Taoism in its classical form, and it is in this way that I shall speak of it.

Its Chinese title is *Tao Teh King*, which we may so far translate 'The Classic of Tao and Teh.' These two words we may at present leave untranslated. To know what this word 'Tao' means, or rather, for the two things are not necessarily coincident, to know what Lao-tsze meant by Tao, is to have the key to the interpretation of the whole book; and as 'Tao' has been variously rendered by scholars, I shall leave it meanwhile in what is perhaps for most of us its complete emptiness of meaning, perfectly neutral in the strife of sinological tongues. It is the unknown which, I hope, may, as we proceed, become more definite for us.

In our attempt to understand the teaching of the *Tao Teh King* we may begin with the first chapter, which is one of the most important metaphysically. In a translation which imitates as far as possible the baldness of the Chinese text, it runs as follows: 'The Tao that can be expressed is not the Eternal Tao; the name that can be named is not the Eternal Name. Nameless, the beginning of Heaven and Earth: Named, the mother of all things. Therefore, he who is ever free from desire can perceive the inner essence: he who ever has desire can perceive only the (outer) limit. These two (the Nameless and the Named) are the same: once the process begins, they are distinguished in name. As the same, they may be called the Obscure. The Obscurity of the Obscure is the gate of all essences.' This then is the text, I admit not a very lucid one, from which we must begin our exposition.

Permit me at the outset to eliminate from our discussion of this chapter one sentence. You will have noticed, along with what is said of Tao, a psychological, or what might even be called an ethical element, in the allusion to the effect of desire. We must be purged of passion if we

would even see Tao. Knowledge, knowledge at least of the ultimate realities, is in this chapter described as only attainable by a moral process, or is at least morally conditioned. In later chapters Lao-tsze carries to strange lengths his theory of the knowledge that is possible to followers of the Taoistic discipline; and his hints were exaggerated by his successors. That need not occupy us now. What we have before us here is the fact of the moral conditions of ultimate knowledge, religious knowledge. And it is hardly necessary to remind you how this fact is insisted on, as by many others of the greatest teachers of mankind, so also in the pages of the New Testament. 'Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God'; 'He that loveth not, knoweth not God.' This reference to the condition of knowing Tao, Lao-tsze introduces in a characteristically naïve way; for in spite of the introductory 'therefore,' it is rather placed alongside the metaphysical doctrine than deduced from it. That it is so introduced is, however, an indication of the fact that Lao-tsze's doctrine, metaphysical and ethical, is one—in short, a system. I content myself here with pointing this out, and now, leaving meanwhile on one side this psychological or ethical element, I ask your attention to what this opening chapter tells us of Tao.

What may fairly be gathered from this chapter is, I think, something like this—Tao is not some one definite thing. All that is definite and so nameable or expressible in words is temporary. The Eternal Existence eludes speech. This eternal Un-nameable is the origin, not the creator, of the universe. So in relation to the universe of things the Un-nameable may be named as Mother. Named or Un-nameable, however, it is one and the same. Nothing can be predicated of it. It is the absolutely dark and obscure. It is essential existence and the source of all essences. The essence of each individual thing comes from this ultimate essence.

So far our first chapter takes us. Let us now add what further descriptions of Tao we may find in subsequent chapters of the Classic. For instance, in chap. 14, we have a restatement of the quite indefinable nature of Tao. 'Seeing you cannot perceive it, listening you cannot hear it, grasping at it you cannot catch it. In no one of these relations can it be brought to question. So in conflux they make one. Above, it is not bright. Below, it is not dark. Everlasting it is, and cannot be named. It returns to nothingness. It is the form of the formless, the shape of the shapeless.' In the main this is simply an emphatic statement of the perfectly unqualified nature of Tao. The most interesting clause is this, 'It returns to nothingness.' Possibly we have here an adumbration of two ideas. First, the idea of a cyclical process through which Tao passes from perfect indefiniteness through definite things back to indefiniteness again. But I think that there is here also the hint of a process not physical but ideal. As we pursue Tao and try to imprison it in some definition, we find that it always eludes us and returns to nothingness. In short, while keeping in mind what has been said by the late Professor Wallace of Oxford, of the deceptive 'fluency with which modern conceptions insinuate themselves under the cover of ancient words,' I still venture to suggest that we have here something very like, something at least which suggests, the familiar Hegelian equation Pure Being = Nothing.

In chap. 40 we have another expression of the idea of process. 'Reversion is the movement of Tao. Weakness is the method of Tao. All things spring from existence: existence springs from non-existence.' Here, I think, we have unmistakably the idea of cyclical or reversionary process. Even more important is it to notice that we have here explicitly the idea that Tao, 'the mother of all things,' is in the last resort rather non-existence than existence.

We seek in vain in our Classic for any explanation of the progress—it were perhaps safer to say process—from Tao to things, from non-existence to existence. We have general statements such as that 'All things rely on Tao for birth' (34), and we have Tao described as 'nursing mother.' In this phrase we should perhaps see something more than the idea of 'origin.' Tao is not only that from which all things come, their 'mother'; Tao is also that by which all things subsist, their 'nursing mother.' Things are immediately dependent on Tao for their present existence. But of any definite cosmogony or statement of the stages of evolution we find no more than this (42), 'Tao produced one: one produced two: two produced three: three produced the world of things.' Commentators have vastly perplexed themselves in trying to explain the One, the Two, and the Three. The initial difficulty is this, that

whereas most of us would be content if we had traced the universe back to a single principle, the One, here Lao-tsze seems to push back to a previous stage, where he finds Tao. If, however, we remember what was said about existence issuing from non-existence, it will perhaps not seem unnatural to say that Tao, the very ultimate, is non-existence, and the One that Tao produces is existence. It is further quite natural, at least for a Chinaman, to see in the Two the Yin and the Yang, the negative and positive, the female and male principles which play such a large part in Chinese philosophy. The Three, however, remains a puzzle. After all, these discussions seem of little moment in determining the value of Lao-tsze's own system. If they have any interest it is only as they bear on the quite independent question of the relation between Taoism and later Chinese philosophy. Only, however we explain the One, the Two, and the Three, we must be on our guard against thinking that Lao-tsze is here interposing a chain of mediating agencies between Tao and this world of visible things. It is quite clear, I think, that in nature and its operations we are to see Tao. In the One, the Two, and the Three we may have the result of an analytical examination of things, the multiplicity of the world is seen to be reducible to three, to two, to one, to Tao. But though it is only at the end of our process of analysis that we come to Tao, we must not suppose that there is, as it were, any *spatial* interval between the proximate multiplicity (this world of things) and the ultimate Unity (Tao).

In chap. 21—a difficult chapter to interpret—we have some further hints of the relation between Tao and things. 'Tao is vague and confused: how confused and vague it is! In it are forms. How vague and confused it is! In it are things. How deep, how dark! In it is essence. This essence is real. In it is truth.' It has been suggested that we are to find here 'something like the Platonic doctrine of ideas.' I hardly think so. The 'forms' which are in Tao are not ideas in the Platonic sense. What we may gather from this chapter of Lao-tsze's book is, I think, this—(1) that individual existences, the actual forms in which things are, originate in Tao; the world with all its specific determinations is to find its sole explanation in Tao; and (2) that Tao is the essence, the truth of things.

There is just one other passage which I should like to bring to your notice before you make up your minds on the question 'What is Tao?' Speaking of Tao in chap. 4, Lao-tsze says: 'I do not know whose son it is. It seems to be prior to Ti' (*i.e.* God). This is to me one of the most significant utterances that we have with regard to Tao. It brings before us the relation between Taoism and the current religion of Lao-tsze's time. We need not here describe that religion further than to say that it included a belief in a Supreme Ruler Ti, with subordinate spirits. Ti, or in more familiar phrase Shang Ti, is the Moral Governor of the universe with control over the forces of nature and the fortunes of men. So far as I know, his relation to the world is thought of as governmental only. Those questions of origin to which we seek an answer in the idea of Creation have not been raised. Now here we find Lao-tsze raising these ultimate questions, and saying that to him Tao seems to have preceded Ti. In other words, Tao seems to him more ultimate than God. Let us note exactly what this amounts to. Lao-tsze does not deny the existence of Ti, though it must be allowed that but for this one reference he completely ignores him. Lao-tsze does imply, however, that Ti, like every other definite existence, must find his explanation, the ground of his existence, in Tao. Ti, in short, just because he is conceived as one existence among many, God over against the world, does not explain himself. And yet as Lao-tsze finds himself driven back in thought behind this definite and limited God, so somehow he fails to find even in Tao a principle that quite explains itself. It is the ultimate term of his analysis, and yet with regard to it, too, the question arises, 'Whence is it?', only to be answered by the confession, 'I do not know whose son it is.' I cannot tell how it may strike others, but to myself there is something pathetic in this hesitating challenge of the popular belief, and bewildered halt on the utmost confines of thought.

(*To be continued.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION XIV. 13.

'And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works follow with them.' —R.V.

THE BEATITUDE OF THE DEAD.

1. The occasion of the Beatitude.—This Book of Revelation was written in a time of martyrdom—whether, as it was generally supposed, in the reign of the Emperor Domitian; or, according to the view recently favoured, a generation earlier and shortly after the persecution of Nero to which Peter and Paul fell victims, in the epoch which commenced with the burning of Rome and closed with the fall of Jerusalem, when the Roman Empire passed through the most terrible convulsions. St. John's vision is livid with the colours of an age of slaughter and devastation. 'Blood and fire and vapour of smoke' fill his strange pictures. You hear the groans of 'souls underneath the altar, slain for the word of God and the testimony which they held,' perpetually crying, 'Lord, how long?' You see them 'coming out of the great tribulation,' with blood-washed robes. 'Blood is given' for drink to those who have 'poured out the blood of saints and prophets, for they are worthy.'

Throughout these scenes of horror, in which the world's sin reaches its natural issue and judges itself by its fruits, the seer discerns the course of redemption and the victory of the Messianic kingdom; he watches the swift advance of Him who sits upon 'the white horse,' whose name is 'Faithful and True,' and who 'in righteousness doth judge and war.' St. John's book is an apocalypse of fiery ruin for the corrupt and cruel powers of the earth that hate the Church of God and strive to drown her in blood, as they would fain have done her Lord; and it is an apocalypse of heavenly comfort to the afflicted and decimated flock of Christ. Amid its mighty thunderings, the sounding of its trumpet blasts, and the pouring out of its bowls full of the unmixed wrath of Almighty God, there comes this tender and consoling sound. For a moment the storm ceases, the trumpets are hushed; a single, clear celestial voice is heard, like that which announced the glad tidings to the shepherds: 'Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.' With what soothing power this music of the angels came to the hearts of those first martyr-mourners, as hurriedly at night, stealing forth in timid bands, they gathered up the mangled forms of their dead recovered from the wild beasts in the arena or the executioner's axe, or haply left charred and half-consumed at the stake![1]

2. The Beatitude.—There are seven Beatitudes in the Book of Revelation. Four of them are closely linked together and refer to the future glory of the Redeemed (14^{13} 19^{9} 20^{6} 22^{14}). This is the first of the four. The next is 'Blessed are they which are bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb' (19^{9}). The allusion plainly is to our Lord's Parable of the Marriage Feast of the King's Son. The third is 'Blessed and holy is he which hath part in the first resurrection' (20^{6}). The reference, says Dr. Findlay, is to the passage from death to life of the believing soul in this world. In Jn 5^{24} Christ says, 'He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.' Then He continues, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.' The last of the four Beatitudes is in 22^{14}: 'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' These four promises together give an enchanting view of the felicity of the dead in Christ.[2] Our text contains the first of the four. Take its words separately.

1. *Blessed.*—The Greek word thus translated means 'happy.' To most minds the more theological word 'blessed' does not convey so much meaning as the more familiar word 'happy.' Christ began the Sermon on the Mount with Beatitudes; so that the first word in the manifesto of the Kingdom of Heaven is the word 'happy.'

[1] G. G. Findlay, *The Things Above*, 170. [2] *Ibid.* 161.

And it is a deliberate, vital, inevitable word. Christ could not have begun with any other word. He did not wish mainly to gain the world's ear, He came to solve the world's problem. And the world's problem is always a question of happiness. Accordingly, as Christ's first word was 'Happy' in the Sermon on the Mount, 'Happy' is His last word here in the Book of Revelation.[1]

Some time ago I saw in London one of the most tragic pictures ever painted. The last rough slope of a mountain leading to the edge of a precipice, at the foot of which one caught a misty glimpse of a graveyard. The slope, packed with a dense crowd of men and women, some in evening dress, some in the garb of toil, some in rags, all struggling to gain a foothold on the highest point, all of them tearing at and treading upon one another, all of them going upwards, where the filmy, beckoning, mocking figure of Pleasure floated out of reach. The picture was called, 'The Pursuit of Pleasure,' and in that grim, ghastly, sunless canvas the artist had not painted one happy face. Not a smile, not a flicker of gladness; nothing but fear, hatred, selfishness, and pain.[2]

2. *Blessed are the dead.*—This attitude to death is new. Hitherto it had been regarded in one of two ways.

(1) It was simply dreaded. This is the attitude of nature to death. Our great poet is her mouthpiece when he says:

> The weariest and most loathed worldly life
> That age, ache, penury, and imprisonment
> Can lay on nature, is a paradise
> To what we fear of death.

That witness is true. Men may disclaim it or reason against it as they will: they are all their lifetime subject to bondage through fear of death.[3]

(2) But there was another attitude to death. Even pagans have called death blessed. Blessed, they said, are the dead, simply because being dead they are done with this life. The Hindu has given the most emphatic expression to this state of mind. If he believed in the transmigration of souls, it was not as a privilege to the good, but a punishment to the bad. The blessedness of the dead consisted in getting rid of this world, in having no more share in aught beneath the circle of the sun.[4]

[1] See P. C. Ainsworth, *The Blessed Life*, p. 47.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 51.
[3] See G. G. Findlay, *The Things Above*, p. 167.
[4] See G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, p. 206.

But here the blessedness is not attributed to all the dead, only to the dead who die in the Lord.

3. *Who die in the Lord.*—It is no exaggeration to say that this phrase 'in the Lord,' or 'in Christ,' s the most important single phrase in the New Testament. It is the key to all the Epistles. Christ is imagined as a great Divine sphere, vast as the love and grace of God. He who by faith enters into that sphere crosses the line of circumference that separates a state of sin and condemnation from a state of justification and holiness. 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.' '

But the phrase has two great interpretations. This redemptive interpretation is the first. The second is that the life of the believer is taken into the life of Christ, his work into Christ's work, his destiny into the destiny of Christ. So St. Paul says (Ro 14^{7-9}), 'None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died, and lived again, that he might be Lord of both the dead and the living.'[5]

'In Christ' is a common expression to signify a condition of safety: 'He hath made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus'; 'And be found in him.' The old Methodist preacher, John Jones of Holywell, used to remark prettily on this latter word: 'When a doctor or lawyer changes his office, he puts a notice on the door or in the window, saying where the business is carried on. And so Paul here puts a notice in the old place he has left—"And to be found in him" henceforth!' 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' Having once been found in Christ, there is no going out any more—they 'die in the Lord.'[6]

'This little preposition "in" signifies a vital union as distinguished from a superficial connection. The superficial connection with the Lord may be credal, or formal, or ecclesiastical, or denominational, and in all these there may be a fatal absence of all vital fellowship with the Lord. Vital union with Christ is essentially an incorporation. It is not a connection effected by some ecclesiastical knot, some denominational tie, some ritualistic ligament; it is the living union of the branch with the vine; it is a communion in whose mystic channels there flows the deepest life of men and God. It is a union so vital and so immediate that if Christ be alive the soul must live in Him.'[7]

4. *From henceforth.*—This difficult expression has been explained in many different ways. (1) It

[5] See A. T. Pierson in *Christian World Pulpit*, xli. 82.
[6] D. Roberts, *A Letter from Heaven*, p. 7.
[7] J. H. Jowett, *Our Blessed Dead*, p. 14.

has been suggested that the reference is not to the bodily dead, but to those who are dead to sin. Blessed are the dead who are dying in the Lord (the participle is present) from henceforth. That is to say, hitherto those who became dead to the law through Christ have had to suffer persecution. But now the persecutor is himself to be destroyed; and from henceforth the condition of those who die with Christ will be a happy one, being free from tyranny and torment.[1]

And there is no doubt that, as Swete says, the message in the first instance is for a particular age, and that it is an encouragement to those who were being called to suffer for their faith. But on the other hand it must be admitted that this is not the natural interpretation of the words 'who die in the Lord.' There remain two explanations worth considering.

(2) It is suggested that from this time forth a change actually takes place in the condition of departed believers. This is how the change is expressed by Canon F. C. Cook: 'The state of good men who died before the coming of Christ appears to me to be always spoken of in the Old Testament as one of true, but very imperfect, blessedness; a period, not indeed of unconsciousness, but of dim expectation. It was scarcely looked forward to with joy by those who trusted confidently in the power and love of God. At the best they would but be "prisoners of hope" still, waiting for their appointed change—for the morning which, after an unknown length of night, would usher in the day of restoration. But when Christ came, when He had accomplished His work, when the blood was shed which atoned for all repented guilt, when His body had hallowed the grave, when His Spirit had burst the bars of the pit and preached to the spirits in Hades, a mighty change was effected—light shone into the pit, the prison became a palace. The future restoration, though not as yet effected, was anticipated; and while all the great spirits of old, who in darkness and trembling had passed into the shadow of death, were filled with a new joy, henceforth all who departed hence in union with Jesus, entered at once into a state of conscious blessedness, knowing, like St. Paul, that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord—present with Him in no dim visionary region, but present in Paradise.'[2]

[1] See H. Crosby, in *The Homiletic Review*, xiv. 37.
[2] F. C. Cook, *Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life*, p. 168.

(3) The third method is to treat the words 'from henceforth' as referring, not to a new condition in the state of the dead, but to a new revelation of that condition.

It is not, says Dr. Matheson, that from henceforth the dead are to be more blessed, but that from henceforth we are to *think* of them as more blessed. It is the proclaiming of a new revelation on the subject, which is to be incorporated for the future with the sum of human knowledge. To the Old Testament Hebrew the dead were not blessed. Death was a penalty; the state of the dead was undesirable. His hope for the departed was that they would come back again. But the devout Christian believer does not wish to bring back his dead. They have departed to be with Christ, and he knows that that is very far better.[3]

Which of these interpretations is the true one? Probably the third. This is the climax of a series of revelations, and, as Swete says, it needed a Voice from heaven to proclaim it. St. Paul, speaking by revelation (1 Co 15^{18}), had taught that the dead in Christ were not to be the subjects of a hopeless grief. St. John (Rev 6^{9}) had 'seen the souls of the martyrs under the Altar crying, How long?' and had heard them bidden to rest awhile. This Voice carries these revelations a step further. Those who should die in the Lord henceforth, as the martyrs did, were to be happy because of the rest on which they entered and the works which followed them into it.

When Mrs. Browning died, her husband wrote—and the words are doubly impressive when one remembers how wonderfully close had been their attachment (for years they never had a meal apart)—'God took her to Himself as you would lift a sleeping child from a dark, uneasy bed into your arms and the light.'

3. **The Response.**—'Yea, saith the Spirit.' The Spirit in the mind of the Seer responds to the Voice from above him. Yea, he answers, they are blessed, to rest (as they shall) from their labours.[4] The Voice said, 'Write'—that is, the voice of God as it sounded from above; and the Spirit said, 'Yea'—that is, the spirit of inspiration and obedience, as it answered from within, ever keen to discern the heavenly revelations, and prompt to perform the heavenly will. That is the picture presented us here,—a something that discloses, and a something that assents,—the announcement

[3] See G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, p. 204.
[4] H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, *in loc.*

of an objective truth, and the presence and the sympathy of a subjective response. It is the same still. For a divinely-appointed plan there must be a divinely-wrought acquiescence. Deep must call unto deep,—the deep of a God that reveals to the deep of a God that complies. Whensoever the Divine voice speaks, and whatsoever the Divine voice says, whether it be, 'This write,' or 'This believe,' 'This do,' or 'This suffer,' the Spirit within men may answer 'Yea,' and no answer is acceptable save the 'yea' which the Spirit returns.[1]

In making this response the Spirit within the Prophet gave two reasons for the blessedness of the dead in Christ: (1) they rest from their labours; (2) their works go with them. These two great reasons are not revealed from without. They are the Seer's own discovery. And yet they are not his own, but are made to him by the Mind of Christ now dwelling in him.

1. *Rest from labour.*—'They rest from their labours.' The Greek word (κόποι) has invariably the sense of trying and distressing labours, exertions which, whether effectual or not, involve a painful strain, efforts often baffled, ever-exhausting, ever reminding us of the condition into which man falls when he deliberately sets his own will against God's will.[2] Even after forgiveness, even after the Christian escapes from the dominion of sin, sin is still there. It meets him everywhere; he is never safe from it. He is pained by its contact; he is humbled by its force; he is grieved by its outbreak. Work is joy; but labour is work's distress. The law of work has its dark shadows —fatigue, infirmity, too great tension, ill-health, disappointments, mistakes, waitings, suspensions, sins. There is the miserable depressing sense of inadequacy for the task; there is the perplexity of what is the line of duty; there are all the entanglements of self. The Greek word has for its root the verb to *cut*; labour cuts to the heart.[3]

They that sleep in the Lord rest from such labours. They rest (1) from the *toil* of labour. They rest (2) from the *woe* of labour. They rest (3) from the *faults* of labour. They rest (4) from the *discouragements* of labour. And they rest (5) from the *disappointments* of labour.[4]

[1] W. A. Gray, *The Shadow of the Hand*, p. 28.
[2] F. C. Cook, *Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life*, p. 169.
[3] J. Vaughan, *Brighton Pulpit*, Ser. 544.
[4] C. H. Spurgeon, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 384.

At the very heart of this word 'labours,' says Mr. Jowett, there is a sense of faintness and exhaustion. It is a word of burdensomeness, wan and drooping, like a stricken plant. The outstanding significance of the word is not the work, but the weariness of the work. Yes, it is a tired word which has lost its spring! 'And Jesus, being *wearied* with his journey!' There you have it, the identical word, carrying the sense of 'spentness,' of limitation, of exhaustion. And, therefore, when we are told that 'the dead in Christ' 'rest from their labours,' we are not to take it as meaning that they rest from their work, but from the weariness of work, which is a far nobler emancipation. To take away the faintness is infinitely more gracious than to take us out of the crusade. The redemption of our blessed dead is redemption from tiredness, redemption from the limitations which arise from small capital; it is redemption from the drooping and the withering; it is entry into the tireless life.

> There everlasting spring abides,
> And never-withering flowers!

That is the word which carries the grace of the evangel—'never-withering'—the land where the inhabitants never say, 'I am sick.' And so we might very accurately paraphrase the familiar sentence in our Beatitude as follows: 'They rest from the laboriousness of labour,' and great services become their native delight. 'They serve Him day and night in His temple.'[5]

It is not difficult to name some of the things which make present labour so laboursome, and from which the blessed dead have found their freedom. There are the *limitations of the body*. We so soon begin to encroach upon our physical capital, and the labouring body becomes a drag upon the eager spirit. 'The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.' Even the evangelization of the world must tarry while 'Jesus, being wearied, sat thus by the well.' How much more we could presumably do for the kingdom if the vital flame did not so speedily smoulder and flicker down into its socket! But it is evident that here our very tiredness is a necessary factor in the campaign, and that the frailty of the body is the mysterious servant of the spirit. But our blessed dead 'drop the robe of flesh,' because its ministry is ended, and 'they rest from the labour' and travail of physical infirmity.

But there is a second element of laboriousness which burdens our temporal service, and that is the seeming *fruitlessness of present labour*. We toil at the wilderness for years, and it appears a wilderness still. And because

[5] J. H. Jowett, *Our Blessed Dead*, p. 19.

we cannot see flowers and fruits we become despondent about growth. Because we are not always seeing results we become dubious about processes. And we grow faint and weary, and the song goes out of our work, and the gay service becomes a humdrum task. Such despair is ever our peril, but it need never be our necessity. There have been men who have toiled and toiled at their desert-patch, and even when no green blade has appeared to cheer the grim waste they have 'endured as seeing Him who is invisible.' But, apart from this, we have not the eyes as yet to see the sure ministries of spiritual processes going on in the secret place. Our eyes are holden, there are necessary veils, earth-clouds form about us, and 'we walk by faith, and not by sight.' But our blessed dead, when they pass behind the veil, become superior to the veil, and every veil becomes transparent. They look 'with other eyes than ours,' they see the first awakenings of mighty destinies, they trace the river from its spring, they 'know even as also they are known,' they have the open vision, and they rest from the laboriousness of uncertain service.

And there is one further element in the burdensomeness of present labours, and that is *our broken correspondence with God.* God is not always real enough to be impressive. Sometimes He seems so gloriously real and immediate that the intervening veil is only like a bridal-veil, and we can almost see His face! 'In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord.' But the alien season returns, and the bridal-veil becomes a fog, and the soul cries out, 'Oh that I knew where I might find Him!' And the seeming nearness or distance of the Lord makes all the difference to the buoyancy or the weariness of our work. But our blessed dead know neither bridal-veil nor fog. They have died into the open glory, into the fellowship where there is no night, the land of which 'the Lamb is the light thereof,' and where service is always in the sunshine, 'and sorrow and sighing have passed away.' They see God, and they rest from the laboriousness of broken communion.[1]

2. *Resumption of Work.*—There is a contrast between the two words 'labours' and 'works.' The labours of the saintly life end in the grave, but not its works; its processes, methods, habits, results, remain, and follow the saint into his new life. The Greek is literally 'they rest from their labours; *for* their works follow with them.' The contrast, says Swete, is latent in the 'for': 'they shall rest from their labours—I say not from their works, for their works go with them.' 'In his own redeemed spirit,' says Findlay, 'in his chastened and ripened character, the dying Christian takes with him the essential part of his life's work. The residue will follow in those who follow him as he followed Christ, in those whom his teaching and his example have led into the way of peace, in the souls saved, the lives uplifted and purified, by his life and words.'

[1] J. H. Jowett, *Our Blessed Dead*, p. 22.

But the thought may be broken up into two parts.

(1) Their works follow with them. That is, as Dr. Findlay suggests, the works they do here are permanently theirs. They are accepted by God, and rewarded by Him. 'The saints,' says Jowett, 'enter the land of glory like monarchs with princely retinues. Their retinue is the radiant assemblage of good works which they have done in their pilgrimage through time.'

To many a humble saint there will be a moment of wondering thankfulness when he sees these his 'children whom God hath given him' clustered round him, and has to say, 'Lord, when saw I thee naked, or in prison, and visited thee?' There will be many an apocalypse of grateful surprise in the revelations of the heavens. We remember Milton's noble explanation of these great words which may well silence our feeble attempts to enforce them:

> Thy works and alms and all thy good endeavour
> Stood not behind, nor in the grave were trod,
> But as faith pointed with her golden rod,
> Followed them up to joy and bliss for ever.

So then, life here and yonder will for the Christian soul be one continuous whole, only that there, while 'their works do follow them,' 'they rest from their labours.'[2]

Carlyle quotes the text at the close of his description of Cromwell's death, and says, 'Their works follow them.' As, I think, this Oliver Cromwell's works have done, and are still doing! We have had our 'Revolutions of Eighty-Eight' officially called 'glorious,' and other Revolutions not yet called glorious; and somewhat has been gained for poor mankind. Men's ears are not now slit off by rash officiality; officiality will, for long henceforth, be more cautious about men's ears. . . . Oliver's works do follow him! The works of a man, bury them under what guano-mountains and obscene owl-droppings you will, do not perish, cannot perish. What of Heroism, what of Eternal Light, was in a man and his life, is with very great exactness added to the Eternities; remains for ever a new divine portion of the sum of things; and no owl's voice, this way or that, in the least avails in the matter.'[3]

2. The other thought is that they resume in glory the work which they have been doing here, but which has been interrupted for a moment by death. They who die in the Lord are not in a state of dim unconsciousness, nor merely in a state of ecstatic trance, visited by gleams of heavenly splendour, or visions of a more glorious hereafter; they are in a state of action, doing works which differ from their works in this life mainly in that the element of struggle, of painful effort, of an all-but perpetual sense of failure and disappointment, is withdrawn,

[2] A. Maclaren, *Expositions of Holy Scripture.*

[3] *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, by T. Carlyle, p. 375.

and replaced by a sabbatic rest—a rest not of idleness or vacuity, but of unbroken, untroubled action.[1]

Is it a fantastic speculation, then, to imagine that the rest of the other world, while a rest from worry, will be a rest not *from* work, but a rest *in* work, the doing of work which it is a joy to do, and which is the reward of all honest effort, which gives full scope not only for such facilities as you have acquired here in the service of your Lord, but for all the pure energies which were checked and hampered here by the body, by circumstances, by the worries of our mortal life?

> And I shall thereupon
> Take rest, ere I be gone
> Once more on my adventure brave and new:
> Fearless and unperplexed,
> When I wage battle next,
> What weapons to select, what armour to indue.[2]

I recently heard a story, well authenticated, regarding the late G. F. Watts, the great painter, which beautifully illustrates the thought as we have it in the Revised Version: 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord . . . that they may rest from their labours, for their works *follow with them*,'—the thought here being, surely, that the rest of the blessed dead will be the full satisfaction of their natures in God's presence hereafter on *the lines of their toil* and *aspiration here*. A distinguished living musician met Watts when the latter was well advanced in years. The two were congenial spirits, and became fast friends. The great master of music spoke to Watts, the master of a sister art, of a curious fact illustrating the kinship of the beautiful in all spheres, namely, that if a line be drawn through the written notes of a perfect melody, it will take the form of a perfect curve. Watts was intensely interested. Some time later the great Christian artist passed away, and his friend received a letter from a near relative of the deceased painter in which he recalled the conversation about the beautiful curves. It would interest the musician to know, the letter said, that Watts, just before his death, when he had sunk into a state of unconsciousness at length opened his eyes, and exclaimed, 'I have seen the Almighty, and the curves are all right!'

[1] F. C. Cook, *Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life*, p. 172.
[2] E. B. Spiers, *A Present Advent*, p. 189.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. A. R. Howell, M.A., Manse of Kincardine, Perthshire, to whom a copy of Wilson's *How God has Spoken* has been sent, and the Rev. F. V. Pratt, M.A., Augaston, S. Australia, to whom a copy of Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for February must be received by the 1st of January. The text is Rev 20^{12}.

The Great Text for March is Rev 21^{1}—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more.' A copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, or Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Forrest's *Christ of History and of Experience*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for April is Rev 21^{5}—'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Holborn's *Architectures of European Religions*, or Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for May is Rev 21^{27}—'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, or of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev $22^{3,4}$—'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Lecky's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Luke of Antioch in Pisidia.

By the Rev. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., Preston.

They returned to Lystra, and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting [them] to continue in the faith, and that through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God.—Ac 14 [21. 22].

The 'we-passages' in the Book of Acts have often been studied to outline the history of their author; but Acts 14[22], the earliest of them, has generally been left out of the group, although Alford, Lumby, and others have, with hesitation, inferred that Luke accompanied Paul on his first journey. The purpose of this paper is to advocate the theory that Luke was actually converted at Pisidian Antioch on that journey.

First, we observe that the word [them] is not warranted by the Greek, though neither of our versions prints it in italic; from the context we ought to supply [us]. From the occurrence of the ἡμᾶς we must infer, as in similar passages, that Luke was a disciple at Lystra, or Iconium, or Antioch. The alternative is that he clumsily dovetails into his narrative a short quotation verbatim. Of such a literary procedure by Luke there is no other instance, nor is there any apparent reason for its occurrence here. It is true that a few instances may be found of change from indirect to direct quotation, as often in Greek; but comparing Lk 5[14], Ac 1[4] 17[3] 23[22], all fail to show the peculiarity here, that the transition is to the first person, not the second. They show that Luke could alternately summarize and quote, not that he interpolates into a summary a phrase written from the standpoint of neither speaker nor recorder, but hearer.

Second, we turn to the report of the previous address at Antioch (Ac 13[16-41]), and again find traces of an ear-witness. It is the longest report of any speech by Paul, the only other to compare with it is that before Festus, which was certainly heard by Luke (Ac 27[1]). Now, for this long report there is no reason in the occasion, or the town, or the speech, or the speaker. There was nothing crucial in the occasion: Paul had been working in synagogues for fourteen years, and in most there would be Gentile sympathizers, as was notorious at Antioch in Syria; the address was delivered at the invitation of the rulers, as usual; it went upon Jewish lines; it was not a turning point as if it was the last ever delivered under such conditions, for at Iconium shortly afterwards, he spoke again in the synagogue. There was nothing remarkable about the town; it was only a Roman colony, of respectable size, and perhaps the most important in Galatia, but hardly more important than Salamis and Paphos, evangelized on the same journey. It will not compare with Syrian Antioch, Ephesus, or Corinth. Luke records no speech delivered by Paul at these ancient capitals where he worked for years, and Luke was not present when Paul opened his campaigns at them; does not this suggest why he made an exception for Pisidian Antioch? If it be rejoined that he made another for the address at Lystra on this same journey, there are two good reasons; this was a typical address to Jews, that a typical address to Gentiles; the latter was in a town whence came Timothy, Luke's frequent companion, whose minute knowledge can be traced in the notices of Lystra, while those of Iconium and Derbe are general. There was nothing remarkable about the speech, which is on the same general lines as that of Peter at Pentecost, an argument on Jewish premises that the Messiah was come in the person of Jesus. There was nothing special about the speaker. Paul was certainly the chief speaker, but the dramatic reversal of rôles had taken place at Paphos; where Barnabas had fallen to the rear. If, then, neither the occasion nor the town nor the speech nor the speaker will account for the lengthy report, must we not suppose some reason personal to the reporter?

This is confirmed by a few difficulties in the address. The chronology of the Judges' period and of Saul's reign, the fusion of quotations at 13[22], have made Alford and Knowling conclude that the speech is reported verbatim, for a revision or condensation would have made these rough

places smooth. So both from the length and from the peculiarities natural with an oral address reported faithfully, we may infer an ear-witness.

Third, there are a few traits in the context that indicate an eye-witness. There is a delicate shade in the word ἐλθόντες at 13[14]. Six other times Luke mentions people entering a synagogue; on these occasions he was absent, and he uses other words. The variation at this place harmonizes with the theory that he was already seated in that synagogue when they entered.

Again, if we compare his story of Christ speaking at Nazareth, we observe that there was no mention then of more than one reading, or of the ruler sending an invitation to speak, and that our Lord sat down for the address, while Paul in this place stood for the purpose. The details, which are given in the Gospel, few as they are, are more numerous than those in Matthew and Mark; that may be due to a Gentile describing foreign customs to a Gentile; the incidental mention of differences here is surely due to an observer.

Similarly we read that Paul beckoned with the hand. This gesture is mentioned by Luke three times more, and by him alone. Peter thus silenced the prayer-meeting in the house of Mary, mother of John Mark; the latter was probably Luke's informant (Ac 12[17]). Alexander tried thus to obtain silence in the theatre of Ephesus (Ac 19[33]); 1 Co 16 shows that Timothy was there, about to pass through Philippi, where his friend Luke was staying. Paul thus secured silence in the temple-court, where Luke possibly was standing (Ac 21[40. 18]). Considering the three people thus mentioned, we cannot assume that the gesture was characteristic of Paul. Neither can we dismiss the phrase as a mere flourish of Luke's rhetoric. He records other speeches at third or fourth hand, four of Peter and one of Stephen, and makes only such a general remark as that he 'opened his mouth.' And when he has to report Paul at Athens, or saying good-bye at Ephesus, or defending himself before the Sanhedrin and Felix, there is no word of this gesture. But before Festus it is noted that Paul stretched forth his hand, and the mention by the apostle of his bonds confirms the accuracy of Luke the eye-witness. It seems, then, most reasonable to suppose that at Pisidian Antioch also Luke saw and noted the movement.

It would certainly have been possible to expect other traces of his presence, as that vv.[43. 48] should have read, 'Many of the Jews and of the devout proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas, who speaking to *us*, urged *us* to continue in the grace of God. . . . And as the Gentiles heard this, *we* were glad,' etc. But without any plea from modesty or from grammar, we may say that Luke is strictly accurate, and that he was not, and did not claim to be, one of the first converts there. That he was converted before their departure is, however, additionally probable from the remark that the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit, which seems rather more personal and experimental than the colourless summaries at Lk 24[52], Ac 9[31] 12[24].

Comparing these touches with the meagre account of the long and successful work at Iconium, the short but graphic account of the doings at Lystra seen by Timothy, and the one line about Derbe, there seems further probability in the theory that Luke was actually present in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch.

The full description of the conference at Jerusalem (Ac 15) is the more natural if Luke was one of those very Gentiles whose future was trembling in the balance, and whose conversion was described by Barnabas and Paul. The speech of Peter, with its reference to the Law as a yoke that could not be borne, would specially interest a man whose Church in Galatia had a letter from Paul mentioning his expostulation with Peter as not himself keeping the Law. The general information could easily be acquired by Luke when he stayed at Jerusalem with Mnason and met James; the text of the apostolic letter was delivered at Pisidian Antioch by Paul and Silas on the second journey.

The silence about the town on this occasion accords with Luke's custom of narrating the breaking of new ground, but not the subsequent steps of consolidation, unless there was something critical. This there was in the circumcision of Timothy, as was seen by the subsequent misunderstandings in the Galatian Churches. But Pisidian Antioch is passed over as briefly as the churches in Syria and Cilicia, or as those in Macedonia on the third journey (Ac 20[1-5]). After passing Pisidian Antioch on this second journey, Paul's party wandered silently through Asia, and Luke did not join them till Troas (Ac 16[6-10]). Young Timothy had no ties to delay him, but a physician would need a little time to decide on throwing up his practice and

arranging his affairs. From Antioch it was easy to reach Troas.

Ramsay has shown that Luke's allusions to the geography of Asia Minor are singularly accurate. But the allusions are restricted. Tarsus and Cilicia are barely mentioned, and the same is the case with Pamphylia, Mysia, and Bithynia; in Asia we only have recorded the stoppages of a company of pilgrims in which Luke travelled. His minute allusions are to the cities of Lycaonia and the region of Galatic Phrygia, exactly the district in which Pisidian Antioch was a chief town. The same detailed accuracy is to be seen in the references to Macedonia, where admittedly Luke laboured, while his geographical references to Achaia are not minute, though accurate. Such facts give further probability that Luke knew well 'the region which was called Phrygian geographically and Galatic politically.'

It may be worth mentioning that Paul's first presence in Pisidian Antioch was due to an infirmity of the flesh, so that his meeting a physician there was very desirable. But we may not insist on Luke's presence in the great company bearing money to Jerusalem. Gaius of Derbe and Timothy could represent all Galatia, and no other representative of Philippi is hinted at, unless it be Luke, who had stayed there on the second journey, and rejoined Paul there on the third.

Certainly he is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, but that is not extraordinary. He was not an elder (Ac $14^{22.23}$); no Galatian at all is mentioned; he was not with Paul when the letter was written; indeed, Ramsay thinks that the letter was penned before Luke came into any close connexion with Paul.

The only letters that do mention Luke were sent to the Colossians and to Timothy at Ephesus, to the province of Asia, whence a high-road ran through Pisidian Antioch, and to a man from another Galatian town.

There seems, then, no reason to be gleaned from the New Testament against the theory that Luke first met Paul at this colony in Galatia, and that he was converted on the outward half of the first journey. Many trifling touches confirm it, and the language of Luke himself implies it in his usual modest fashion, but plainly.

In the Study.

A Study in the Sphere of Supposition.

The latest volume of sermons by the Rev. G. H. Morrison, M.A., is called *The Return of the Angels* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). The last sermon in it is called 'The Sphere of Supposition.' Mr. Morrison has taken the word 'supposing' out of three places in which it is found in the New Testament, and made it the subject of his sermon.

It is a manner of preaching that is not so common as it might be. The objection to it is that it is so easy. But when trouble is taken with it, as Mr. Morrison takes trouble, there is no manner of preaching that is at once so interesting and so edifying. It has the interest of variety; it has the edification of systematic theological instruction.

Mr. Morrison's word is 'supposing.' It is not a strong word. It is not the word of strong people. 'I suppose so'—but why do you not think? why do you not find out?

1. The first text is Lk 2^{44}—'Supposing him to have been in the company.' It is taken from the story of the visit of Jesus to the Temple when He was a boy. It is a story of singular charm. It is both natural and supernatural. There are other stories of His infancy, but they are only supernatural, and therefore incredible.

When the Feast was over, Joseph and Mary turned home again. They were with their friends. It was a large company. And, 'supposing that Jesus was in the company' also, they went a day's journey. They were a little to blame. They should have found out. But do we not ourselves sometimes suppose that we have what we have not? Do we not sometimes suppose that we have Christ?

Where is He? He is about the Father's business. He is always about the Father's business. We can therefore always tell whether we have Him or not. We have Him if we also are about the Father's business. If we are not about the Father's business, we have Him not.

And if we have not Christ, we have not the things of Christ, however we may think we have them. That is the point which Mr. Morrison makes. 'We think that what yesterday we loved and cherished is still in the circle of our life to-day. And we know not that in secret it has left us, and stolen away from our side on feet of wool, and onward we move unconscious of our loss, supposing it is still in our company. The fact is,' says Mr. Morrison, 'that all we ever gained has to be kept with an unceasing vigilance.' There is an anecdote in the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*, another of the books of the month, 'I was once sitting in a room where I had to wait for half an hour before a meeting, and by the fire was sitting a poorly clad, rather wretched-looking, old man, gently moaning at intervals. I asked him if anything was the matter, and he said, "No—I was only just thinking what a deal of trouble it takes to get the world right and to keep it right."' Yes, it takes trouble.

2. The second text is Jn 20^{15}—'She, supposing him to be the gardener.' It is again taken from a charming story, a story mingled of the natural and the supernatural. It was the morning of the Resurrection, and Mary Magdalene had come early to the tomb. She found it empty. It was a surprise and a great shock to her. Did art invent the surprise and the shock? Did art invent the angels? She saw two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. 'Woman, why weepest thou?' they asked. She answered, 'Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.' Then she heard a movement in the grass. She turned round, and Jesus was at her side. But she, supposing Him to be the gardener——

We suppose Him to be the gardener still. A working man, we say. And we feel so religious as we say it. Here is something from another book of the month, from a remarkable book, *The Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, by Henry W. Clark (Robert Scott). 'They are everlastingly drawing pictures,' says Mr. Clark, 'of the Christ in which the mere outward frame, as it were (wherein He was one of us), is correctly given, but wherefrom all sign of that inner light of infinite holiness (which stamps Him as coming from a world we never saw) has been left out; and the loud-mouthed demagogues are ever proclaiming that most grotesque of all modern gospels, that Christ was a working man.'

He *was* a working man. But when we have said it, what have we said? Can a working man save us? Was it a working man that endured the cross, despising the shame? Was it a working man that felt the joy that was set before Him? He *was* a working man; but one evening He laid His tools aside for the last time and went out to save the world.

That evening, when the Carpenter swept out
The fragrant shavings from the workshop floor,
And placed the tools in order, and shut to
And barred for the last time the humble door,
And, going on His way to save the world,
Turned from the labourer's lot for evermore,
I wonder, was He glad?

That morning, when the Carpenter walked forth
From Joseph's cottage, in the glimmering light,
And bade His holy mother long farewell;
And through the skies of dawn, all pearly bright,
Saw glooming the dark shadow of a cross,
Yet, seeing, set His feet towards Calvary's height,
I wonder, was He sad?

Ah! when the Carpenter went on His way
He thought not for Himself of good or ill.
His path was one through shop or thronging men
Craving His help, e'en to the cross-crowned hill,
In toiling, healing, loving, suffering—all
His joy and life to do His Father's will,
And earth and heaven are glad!

And is there not the danger that we may make this mistake with others also? Is it not possible that we may misunderstand a neighbour—supposing him to be the gardener. That is Mr. Morrison's point here. 'We have lived with them,' he says, 'and seen their faults and failings, and think we have gauged them in their strength and weakness. Then unexpectedly there comes an hour to them when they are called to do or suffer in the heroic way, and in that hour it is farewell for ever to our pitiful estimates of yesterday.'

3. The third text is Ac 16^{27}—'Supposing that the prisoners had been fled.' The story has not the idyllic charm of the other two. For Luke is not so fascinating as a writer when he relates the deeds of the Apostles as when he relates that

which Jesus began to do and teach. But it is a graphic account of one of the most memorable incidents in history.

Paul and Silas, having deprived some men of the gains they got by exploiting a poor demented woman, were thrust into prison and their feet were made fast in the stocks. But at midnight they prayed and sang praises. Then their chains fell off and the prison doors flew open. Again it is a combination of the natural and the supernatural. The jailer was roused out of his sleep, and drew his sword to kill himself, 'supposing that the prisoners had been fled.'

But he did not know the nature of the prisoners he had. He never had Christians in his cells before, and he did not know how they were likely to behave. 'Do thyself no harm; for we are all here.'

And even yet, even when Christianity is so familiar as a profession and a practice, men of the world suppose that Christians will act as they would act themselves. They try to 'give as much as they get,' and when a Christian turns the other cheek, they suspect some simplicity or cunning. They do not even understand the language of Christianity. There is an amusing story in the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson.* But it is a story with plenty of the tragedy of life in it also. A wife was once complaining to a clergyman of her husband's unsatisfactory conduct. 'You should heap coals of fire on his head,' he said. To which she replied, 'Well, I tried boiling water, and that did no good!'

The world does not understand the very language of Christianity. It is surprised and puzzled with the conduct of Christians. But, says Mr. Morrison, it is the unexpected that is the charm of the follower of Christ.

Studies in Failure.

I.

The Many and the Few.

Mt 22^{14}, 'Many are called, but few are chosen.'

1. There is nothing that receives more attention on earth than failure and success. The newspapers are mostly occupied either with the advantages obtained by those who succeed, or with the misfortunes of those who fail. And even the great philosophy of our day—that philosophy, called Darwinism, which has revolutionized thought in almost every department of knowledge—is based on the observation of success and failure. Its very title is 'The Struggle for Existence, and the Survival of the Fittest.'

And the fittest are the few. So says Darwinism, and so says the Bible. Of all upon whom the Flood came, 'few, that is, eight persons were saved.' Of all the inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain, only Lot and his two daughters escaped the destruction. Of the vast multitude who left Egypt for the Land of Promise, only two, Caleb and Joshua, entered into possession of it.[1] For many are called, but few are chosen.

It is not a matter of election, at least not yet. The calling is the invitation to the marriage feast. The words are found at the close of the Parable of the Labourers, but their place is not there. Their place is at the end of the Parable of the Feast which the king gave on the occasion of the marriage of his son. Of the many who were invited to that feast, only the few accepted the invitation. It is simply that fact, at first. And the fact is seen in every department of life—few accept, and many refuse.

The word 'remnant,' says Newman, is frequent with the prophets, from whom St. Paul takes it. Isaiah, for instance, says, 'Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a *remnant* shall be saved.' Jeremiah speaks of 'the *remnant* of Judah,' and the 'small number,' to which a return was promised. Ezekiel, too, declares that God 'will leave a *remnant*,' 'that ye may have some,' continues the divine oracle, 'that shall escape the sword among the nations, when ye shall be scattered through the countries. And they that escape of you shall remember me among the nations, whither they shall be carried captives.' And so well understood was this, that the hope of good men never reached beyond it. Neither the promise, on the one hand, nor the hope, on the other, ever goes beyond the prospect of a remnant being saved. Thus the consolation given to the Church in the Book of Jeremiah is, that God 'will not make a *full* end; and Ezra, confessing the sins of his people, expresses his dread lest there should be '*no* remnant.' Thus Christ, His Apostles, and His Prophets, all teach the same

[1] See R. H. McKim, *The Gospel in the Christian Year*, 137.

doctrine, that the chosen are few, though many are called: that one gains the prize, though many run the race.[1]

To every thoughtful person, the most perplexing of all problems is the apparent waste of human life, the comparative failure of the gospel of Christ to regenerate the world. If I might speak for myself, I should say that I find no difficulties at all in religion compared to this.

When I pass through the streets of a great city, when I am in the midst of the thronging crowds of London, or when I try to realize to myself the teeming millions of human beings in India or in China, when I think of the innumerable multitude who are outside all religious influences whatever, or when I remember the myriads of those who *have* heard of Christ, who *have* listened to His gracious invitations, and yet are still so unmoved, so careless, so worldly, so wrapped up in their business and their pleasure, apparently so regardless of the unseen, the spiritual, and the eternal; when all this is borne in upon my soul, I do feel that other difficulties pale into insignificance compared with them. Sure I am that it is this seeming waste of human life, of the individual life, which weighs most heavily upon the souls of those who think and feel for their brother-men; it is this thought which wrings the almost despairing, the pathetic cry from our great modern poet, as he contemplates it in nature—

So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life;

That I, considering everywhere
Her secret meaning in her deeds,
And finding that of fifty seeds
She often brings but one to bear,

I falter where I firmly trod,
And, falling with my weight of cares
Upon the great world's altar stairs
That slope through darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
And gather dust and chaff, and call
To what I feel is Lord of all,
And faintly trust the larger hope.[2]

2. But what is success? There is material, intellectual, or moral success.

1. Success is material. It is making money, a position; it is 'getting on in the world.' Few get on in the world. And it is not for the want of direction. There are innumerable books, written mostly for young men, which contain the rules for getting on in the world. One of them[3] reduces the rules to these five—Push, Tact, Faith, Grit, Skill. The aim is obvious. The very words are worldly. For 'faith' here is simply venture. The man who is to succeed must sometimes take risks. Yet if he is to get on in a worldly-wise manner, he will reduce the chance of mistake as much as possible; he is advised to look well before he leaps. But with all encouragement, only the few succeed. Take the unassailable evidence of Professor Mackenzie's *Manual of Ethics*:[4] 'Those who fix their attention on the lives of individuals have always sufficient ground for Pessimism. Even the most favoured human beings attain only a small part of what they hope; and what they hope is generally but a small part of what they would wish to be able to hope. And a large proportion of the human race scarcely seem to get the length of hope at all.'

2. Success is intellectual. Turn again to Professor Mackenzie, 'Conscious of the failure of life and society, many of the finest natures have taken refuge in Art. Matthew Arnold, in one of the most striking of his poems,[5] represents Goethe as turning from the vain strife of his age, after having exposed its weaknesses, and proclaiming to his contemporaries as their last resort—"Art still has truth, take refuge there."' But what does Goethe say at the end of it? 'I will say nothing,' he writes in 1824, 'against the course of my existence. But at bottom it has been nothing but pain and burden, and I can affirm that during the whole of my seventy-five years, I have not had four weeks of genuine well-being. It is but the perpetual rolling of a rock that must be raised up again for ever.'[6]

Intellectually, Goethe had been one of the few who succeed. Their number is less than the number of those who succeed materially. But even when intellectual success is obtained, it does not seem to be always satisfying.

3. Success is moral. This is what Professor Mackenzie comes to. 'Men may seek a temporary relief in Art,' he says, 'from the struggle of life; and it may be a not unworthy commendation to say of a great poet—

The cloud of mortal destiny,
Others will front it fearlessly—
But who, like him, will put it by?

But even this service can be rendered to us by Art only so long as it is believed by us to be a revelation of a deeper truth in things.' Now this deeper truth is found in harmony with nature with-

[1] J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, v. 255.
[2] See G. H. Fowler, *Things Old and New*, 58.
[3] *Factors of Success*, by H. T. Whitford.
[4] Fourth Edition, 1900, p. 440.
[5] 'Memorial Verses.'
[6] Quoted by W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 137.

out and with the moral law within. It is found in harmony with the will of God. And again, if moral success is harmony with God's will, it is evident that many are called to it, but few are chosen.

There is an American book among this month's issues entitled *Victorious Manhood* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). The author is Dr. Howard A. Johnston. It is moral manhood that is the subject. And if we would see how few they are that find it, we have but to read the titles of the chapters. He who reaches moral manhood has (1) the Spirit of Sonship, (2) the Spirit of Surrender, (3) the Spirit of Stewardship, (4) the Spirit of the Soldier, (5) the Spirit of the Servant, (6) the Spirit of the Soul-winner, (7) the Spirit of Strength through Hardships, and (8) the Spirit of the Saint.

But this is no more than our Lord meant when He told the young ruler to keep the commandments. Only the few can answer, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' And what is that? Who can sell all that he has and give to the poor? Who can be perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect?

3. What are the causes of failure?

1. One cause is that while many are called, only few are chosen. And what is that? It is simply that they themselves do not choose. The parable makes that unmistakable. Many were invited to the wedding feast, few accepted the invitation. They were busy otherwise, one with his farm, another with his merchandise. The parable passed into real life, and became deep enough tragedy, when Jesus stood over Jerusalem, and said, 'How often would I . . . but ye would not.'

But the word is very significant. It is not 'few choose'; it is 'few are chosen.' It is parallel to that other word, 'they which were bidden were not worthy.' Not worthy? They were the élite of the land. In comparison with those who came from the lanes and byways they were surely worthy to sit at a king's table. The king himself says they were not worthy. And their conduct proved it. For if they would not rise to a sense of the honour done them in receiving this invitation, they were not worthy to sit at the table. And, in like manner, they who do not choose to come are not chosen. It is no mystery of election. It is the will of man refusing to fall in with the will of God.

2. The only other cause of failure is that men choose in a wrong way. When the king came in to see his guests he found a man who had not on a wedding-garment. He had come, but he had come in his own way. The rest of the guests were provided with a wedding-garment as they entered; he refused it. He was content with the garment he wore. And very likely it was better than the garment in which many of the other guests came to the door. The garment of the Pharisee who went up to the Temple to pray was very likely better than the garment of the Publican. And yet it was the Publican who went down to his house justified.

Can there, then, be any doubt as to the meaning of the wedding-garment? It is God's way of acceptance, not man's. It is 'the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.'

Dr. John Pulsford[1] warns us that we must have a righteousness of our own, and the warning is wise. But only our own in the sense that the wedding-garment, once gifted to the guest, is now his own. Certainly the righteousness of Christ is none the less righteousness that it is received, and none the less our righteousness. And certainly righteousness is just right living. But the acceptance, the place at the Feast, is not ours because we are righteous; it is ours because we have 'put on Christ.'

There is no clearer illustration than the life of Chalmers. When he was called to the parish of Kilmany, Chalmers simply did not know God. He chose the ministry as a profession, but he would have preferred a Chair of Mathematics if he could have got it. Then came his great illness. He was face to face with the seriousness of life. He was face to face with death. On his recovery, he began to keep a journal. It is a record of heroic efforts to make himself acceptable to God. It is heroic, but it is pitiful. For he has little success in it, and no satisfaction in the little success he has. He has come to the feast, but he is determined to wear his own wedding-garment. At the end of a year he read Wilberforce's *View of Christianity*. Ten years afterwards, in a letter to his youngest brother, he described the result.

My dear Alexander,—I stated to you that the effect of a very long confinement, about ten years ago, upon myself, was to inspire me with a set of very strenuous resolutions, under which I wrote a Journal, and made many a laborious effort to elevate my practice to the standard of

[1] *Loyalty to Christ*, ii. 355.

the Divine requirements. During this course, however, I got little satisfaction, and felt no repose. I remember that somewhere about the year 1811, I had Wilberforce's View put into my hands, and, as I got on in reading it, felt myself on the eve of a great revolution in all my opinions about Christianity. I am now most thoroughly of opinion, and it is an opinion founded on experience, that on the system of—Do this and live, no peace, and even no true and worthy obedience, can ever be attained. It is, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. When this belief enters the heart, joy and confidence enter along with it. The righteousness which we try to work out for ourselves eludes our impotent grasp, and never can a soul arrive at true or permanent rest in the pursuit of this object. The righteousness, which, by faith, we put on, secures our acceptance with God, and secures our interest in His promises, and gives us a part in those sanctifying influences by which we are enabled to do with aid from on high what we never can do without it. We look to God in a new light—we see Him as a reconciled Father; that love to Him which terror scares away re-enters the heart, and, with a new principle and a new power, we become new creatures in Jesus Christ our Lord.[1]

A Study in the Life of Isaac.

It is the first sermon in a volume which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published, and of which Professor Hugh Mackintosh, of the New College, Edinburgh, is the author. Its title is *Life on God's Plan* (5s.). That is also the title of the first sermon.

Life on God's plan—that, says Dr. Mackintosh, was the life of Isaac. For there are three elements in a life lived according to the will of God, and they are all in the life of Isaac, and all 'within the four corners' of Professor Mackintosh's text. 'Isaac builded an altar there, and called upon the name of the Lord, and pitched his tent there; and there Isaac's servants digged a well' (Gn 26^{25})—that is the text. And the three elements are the *altar*, the *tent*, and the *well*. That is to say, *religion*, *home*, and *work*.

1. Religion.—'He builded an altar there and called upon the name of the Lord.' The erection of an altar is almost a standing formula in the history of the patriarchs. And the Pilgrim Fathers, when they stepped on the savage shores of the New World, provided first for the house of God. It is the first or basal element in a complete existence.

2. The second element in our life, as God plans it, is a **Home.** 'Isaac pitched his tent there.' A tent? Emblem of the life of the 'sojourner as in a strange country'? Yes, a tent, that we may remember to cultivate a detached spirit in regard to things unseen. For, as Robert Barbour used to say, 'Like the Jacobites, our King too is over the water.' But although a tent, it was a home. Round that little shed of canvas clustered Isaac's dearest hopes. Thither Rebekah came. There his children were born. There he exercised the hospitality so dear to an Oriental heart, and sat in the evening light to dispense justice to his people. To him it was the focus of experience.

Dr. Mackintosh observes the simplicity of Isaac's home life. And then, more emphatically, the pervasion of Isaac's home-life by the spirit of religion.

3. Work.—'There Isaac's servants digged a well.' For work is not necessarily toil, but different, and these two will one day be separated once for all. 'His servants shall serve him,' when 'sorrow and sighing shall flee away.' Does not the well feed both tent and altar? As for the well and the altar, the one means work, and the other means sacrifice; and how can a man offer sacrifice who does no work? How can a man be made fit for the high fellowship of God, or indeed for the pure felicity of home, if he escapes the discipline, the long education, of worthy and honest toil?

[1] W. Hanna, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers*, i. 185.

Two Studies in Old English.

A Mere Man.

The first is the adjective *mere*. There is a substantive *mere* also, but it is a different word. The substantive—which means 'the sea,' and is of Teutonic derivation, though connected with Latin *mare*—is altogether obsolete, although it may still be used effectively in poetry or in poetic prose. There are two substantives indeed, the other meaning a boundary, also of Teutonic origin and connected with the Latin *murus*.

As there are two substantives, so, to be quite exact, are there two adjectives. There is an old adjective *mere* which means 'illustrious,' and of which no clear example has been found by Murray later than the fourteenth century.

The adjective we have to do with is of classical origin. It comes from the Latin *merus* which means 'undiluted' as applied to wine, or 'unmixed' as applied to peoples and languages.

Now this adjective 'mere' has passed through

one of the strangest experiences of any word in the English language. The best account of it is given by Craik in his book on *The English of Shakespeare*. Speaking of the adverb 'merely,' Craik says: 'It separates that which it designates or qualifies from everything else. But in so doing the chief or most emphatic reference may be made either to that which is included, or to that which is excluded. In modern English it is always to the latter; by "merely upon myself" we should now mean upon nothing else except myself; the *nothing else* is that which the *merely* makes prominent. In Shakespeare's day the other reference was the more common, that, namely, to what was included; and "merely upon myself" meant upon myself altogether, or without regard to anything else. *Myself* was that which the *merely* made prominent. So when Hamlet, speaking of the world, says (i. 2), "Things rank and gross in nature possess it *merely*," he by the *merely* brings the *possession* before the mind, and characterizes it as complete and absolute; but by the same term now the prominence would be given to something else from which the possession might be conceived to be separable; "possess it merely" would mean have nothing beyond simply the possession of it (have, it might be, no right to it, or no enjoyment of it).'

Craik gives a good example of the misunderstanding that sometimes arises through the change that has taken place in the meaning of *mere* and *merely*. His example is from Bacon's essay 'Of Vicissitudes of Things.' Bacon says: 'As for conflagrations and great droughts, they do not merely dispeople and destroy,' meaning that they do not *altogether* do so. But modern editors have changed the sentence, sometimes leaving out the 'not' and sometimes changing the 'and' into 'but.'

The word does not occur in the A.V., but it is an important word in the history of theology, where its misunderstanding has done something to discredit the doctrine of election. 'God, having of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life'—so the Shorter Catechism—and the liberal theologian holds up his hands in horror. But the word is as gracious as it is expressive. In the last sermon which Latimer preached before King Edward, a sermon on Covetousness (the date is 1550), we read that the sparrows 'are fed by God's mere providence and goodness.' In the Pastoral Letter which Knox left with his brethren in Scotland when he accepted the call to the English congregation in Geneva (the date is 1556), we find a like sentiment: 'Let your toungis learne to prais the gracious gudness of him wha of his meir mercie hath callit you fra darknes to lyght and fra deth to lyfe.'

As illustrative (and perhaps the original) of the passage in the Shorter Catechism, take this from *The Judgement of the Synod at Dort*: 'Now Election is the vnchangeable purpose of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, according to the most free pleasure of his will, and of his meere grace, out of all mankinde, fallen through their owne fault, from their first integrity into sinne and destruction, hee hath chosen in Christ vnto saluation a set number of certaine men, neither better, nor more worthy then others.'

Take no Thought.

The other study may be short. It is the word *thought*. There is an article on it in the *Dictionary of the Bible* (iv. 754). It is referred to here because in an article in the *Hibbert Journal*, of which there is some account on another page, the writer, from want of the knowledge of the meaning of this word in the Authorized Version, charges our Lord with utterly condemning provident regard for the future. His words are these: 'Provident regard for the future is utterly condemned. "Take no thought for the morrow" is an absolute injunction. But all our Insurance Societies are avowedly founded on the opposite of this. Friendly, Co-operative, and Trade Union Societies are organized on the principle condemned in this sermon, and Christian governments prepare their national budgets at least twelve months in advance. The principle of some of these instructions may have its value as an ideal. But as regulative ideas for the government of personal conduct and associated life they have been useless, and they have been mischievous.'

On this characteristic paragraph it will be sufficient to quote the comment of Dr. James Drummond: 'Mr. Roberts declares, "Provident regard for the future is utterly condemned. *Take no thought for the morrow* is an absolute injunction"; and he seems greatly pleased that the world has shown itself superior to this foolish precept. A note to Pope's translation of the *Odyssey* says: "When critics find fault, they ought to take care

that they impute nothing to an author, but what the author really speaks, otherwise it is not criticism, but calumny and ignorance." On the justice of this remark I must allow the readers to pronounce. I am sure Mr. Roberts would not willingly lapse into the fault which is here stigmatized; but I fear that in this case he has yielded to one of those deluding naps to which even the "good Homer" occasionally succumbed. As Macaulay would have observed, "every schoolboy knows" that there is no such precept as Mr. Roberts quotes in the Sermon on the Mount, and that its appearance in the Authorized Version is due to a phrase which, in its modern meaning, has become a glaring mistranslation, and accordingly has been altered by the revisers. It is not necessary to remind readers of the HIBBERT JOURNAL that the precept is directed against the distrustful "anxiety" which makes the "word" unfruitful. It will be a happier as well as a better world when men are filled with the quiet content of an assured trust, and, having fulfilled their duties, leave their outward lot without doubt or fear to the disposal of Providence.'

The Logia of the Baptist.

BY THE REV. J. C. TODD, M.A., B.Sc., OAKFIELD SCHOOL, CROUCH END, LONDON.

ST. JOHN the Baptist is one of the most striking figures in Jewish history, but both sources of our knowledge of him (Josephus and the Gospels) have been regarded with suspicion. The passage in Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII. v. 2) has been denounced as an interpolation, and the accounts of the Evangelists are supposed to be coloured by the prejudices of the Apostolic Church.

It is therefore highly important to show (if we can) that we are in possession of a document which is free from taint and proceeds from the disciples of St. John himself.

In the first section of St. Mark's Gospel (1^{2-8}) we have obviously the regular Christian account of the Baptist in so terse a form that it seems to carry us back to the pre-literary stage and to be designed for oral repetition. We have, first, the two great texts from the Bible (*i.e.* the Old Testament); the former used on the authority of our Lord (Lk 7^{27}), and the latter on that of the Baptist himself (Jn 1^{23}). Then follows a brief account of St. John's Baptism; and lastly, his great 'witness' of the 'One stronger than I,' and the prophecy of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The account of the Baptist's food and clothing (v.^{6}) is probably due to the Evangelist himself, being one of the graphic details in which he delights.

When we turn to the third chapter of St. Luke we find something totally different, and it is the object of this paper to show that in the first twenty verses we have a source-document of the Baptist's teaching, and that it owes nothing to Christian editing except the abridgment at its conclusion.

1. The elaborate list of reigning authorities (the Emperor, the Procurator, three Tetrarchs, and two High Priests) is given definitely as the date when 'the word of God came to John.' This is not a sufficiently specific *Christian* date to justify the use of some forty words in expressing it. The suggestion of von Soden (*Enc. Bib.* 'Chronology,') that it is really meant to help us to the date of the Crucifixion, can hardly be correct, since it is almost impossible to say how long a period the Evangelist assigns to the ministries of the Baptist and our Lord. A Christian compiler might *incorporate* such a statement but hardly *compose* it for himself.

2. The sonorous roll of these names reads like the beginning of a treatise, and we find the phrase 'the word of the Lord (or God) to . . .' in the *opening verse* of seven of the fifteen prophetical books of the Old Testament. The Greek is usually λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς, but in Jer 1^{1} we have ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ as here. Otherwise the sentence more nearly resembles Zec 1^{1}.

3. The section (v.$^{10-14}$) which relates the questions of the people and the answers of the Baptist has no Messianic or Christian significance, and is on that account omitted in the parallel text of St. Matthew.

4. In v.[16] we have the announcement of the coming baptism, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. This became famous in the early Church as a prophecy of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the difficulty of the 'fire' was met in two ways. On the one hand St. Mark simply omits it, and on the other we have the writer of the Acts (2[3]) telling us that γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός appeared at Pentecost, while Justin Martyr relates that at the Lord's Baptism a fire was kindled in the Jordan (*Dial. c. Try.* 88). This latter belief was common (Otto's *Justin, ad loc.*).

In view of the great importance of this text it is startling to find a reading (in St. Luke only) which omits 'holy,' and by so doing (as we shall see) turns 'spirit' into 'wind.' No doubt it is poorly attested (Hort, Appendix to Introd. p. 57), but the fact that it has survived at all leads us to accept it without hesitation and makes us realize that we are in the presence of a definitely pre-Christian text.

That by πνεῦμα the Baptist understood 'wind' and not 'spirit' is evident from the following verse. He pictures the Minister of Judgment standing on the threshing-floor with the shovel in his hands, throwing the wheat into the air, that the chaff may be blown away by the *wind*, and when it has heaped itself up, be destroyed by *fire*. (An indistinct recollection of this meaning of πνεῦμα is probably preserved in the πνοή of Ac 2[2] side by side with the πνεῦμα of v.[4]).

It is possible, of course, that the idea of 'wind and fire' is primary and the figure of the threshing-floor simply a happy illustration, for it is plausible to derive the doctrine of the two baptisms from Is 4[4], ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος τὸν ῥύπον τῶν υἱῶν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων Σιών, καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐκκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐν πνεύματι κρίσεως καὶ πνεύματι καύσεως; but whether the 'threshing-floor' be text or commentary it determines the meaning of πνεῦμα.

5. After the great Messianic prophecy (vv.[16, 17]) we have a fairly well-turned Greek sentence (vv.[18-20]) carrying us on to St. John's imprisonment. John preached 'many other things' and reproved Herod for Herodias and 'all his wicked deeds,' and was accordingly shut up in prison. The most obvious explanation of this sentence is that the Evangelist has already got his most important quotation and now quickly but carefully sums up the rest of the book before him.

6. Assuming that vv.[1-17] are a quotation, and vv.[18-20] a summary, it is evident that this source was not a Christian work. It contained no account of the Baptism of the Lord. St. Luke has to turn back from John's imprisonment to relate this event. If he had found it in his previous source he would surely have inserted it between vv.[18, 19].

7. A few minor points may be added, of no great weight individually, but tending to increase the cumulative force. (*a*) John is called 'the son of Zacharias' here only in the Gospel, but there may be a reference to chap. 1 in this designation. (*b*) The quotation from Isaiah is carried on beyond the ordinary Christian stopping-place (Matt. and Mk.). (*c*) John addresses the crowds as 'broods of vipers.' This is not in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel, and in Matthew the 'crowds' are altered to the 'Pharisees and Sadducees.'

From all this we may conclude that we have here an original document from the school of the Baptist, and this is of importance not only for itself but for the criticism of Q (the Logia of Jesus). As restored by Harnack, Q begins with the words of the Baptist, a section which is quite in place in a Gospel but hardly in a collection of Sayings of the Lord. This comes into Q simply by the mechanical process of selecting the non-Marcan material common to St. Matthew and St. Luke. If the arguments given above are sound, we restore this section to its context in St. Luke's Gospel and show that the 'Logia of John' probably antedated and possibly suggested the 'Logia of Jesus.'

When was the book of the Logia of the Baptist compiled? If, as St. Luke suggests, it ended with St. John's imprisonment, we have the fascinating suggestion that it was compiled before his death. I do not, however, think that this was the case. Whoever first wrote Lk 3[1, 2], it remains a curious passage because the date is given *precisely* in the first clause, and only vaguely in the others. Pilate and the tetrarchs add nothing to chronological accuracy, and were probably inserted *for some other reason*. Does Josephus throw any light on this? He tells us (*loc. cit. supra*) that some people regarded the defeat of Antipas by Aretas as a judgment for the execution of the Baptist. Now the curious fact is that (with one exception) all the men mentioned in these verses were overtaken by misfortune a few years after the death of the Baptist (especially if we assume that the date

29 A.D. given here is correct for his 'call'). Tiberius and Herod Philip died. Pilate was recalled, Antipas was banished, Caiaphas was deposed. Whoever Lysanias of Abilene may have been, he lost his tetrarchy. I believe that the writer meant us to see (and probably pointed out in his book) how widespread and terrible was God's judgment.

Major est vis instantiae negativae and no known disaster happened to the high priest Annas. But the correct reading is ἐπ' ἀρχιερέως, which suggests that either Annas or Caiaphas is a later interpolation (perhaps by the Evangelist when he copied the passage). Now we know from Josephus that Caiaphas was high priest at this time, and we also know that the writer of the Acts (perhaps our Evangelist) had a theory that Annas was still high priest in spite of his deposition (Ac 4^6). It is therefore probable that the Logia of the Baptist had simply ἐπ' ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα in this place.

Literature.

WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

In the history of literature, as well as in the history of the Church, the end of the year 1909 will be remembered because in it was published the first volume of the Standard Edition of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (Culley; 21s. net). The Standard Edition of Wesley's Journal will consist of six volumes. To those who purchase the whole work, the price, as we see from the advertisements, will be only three guineas, and there is an offer made to subscribers that one guinea may be paid on subscription, and half a guinea on the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4, and 5; whereupon the last volume will be sent free.

The editor is the Rev. Nehemiah Curnock, who has not only been preparing materials for this final edition throughout many years, but has also himself, for a much greater length of time, been prepared for it. He has had a sense of his high calling, and he has been aware that he is surrounded with a great cloud of witnesses. Many of these witnesses have gone before. Mr. Curnock does not doubt that he is doing his work under the eye of Wesley himself. Many of them are yet unborn. For this edition is not named 'Standard' without sufficient foresight. So thorough has been the search for materials, in the New World as in the Old, that there is not the least prospect of anything important lying yet concealed. And so wisely have the materials been used that the estimate here reached of John Wesley's character and John Wesley's career may safely be stated to be final. It is a great opportunity for the Church of Christ. Without respect of creed or combination, let the student of the history of Religion seize the opportunity of reading this Journal throughout, page by page.

The new material is extensive and vital. It does not involve a reversal of our judgment on John Wesley, but it involves considerable modification of it. And it is such modification as Wesley's greatest admirer need not shrink from making; for it is all in the direction of nobility. It shows John Wesley to have had a greater mind than we knew he had, a larger heart than we knew; it shows that he had found the brook Jabbok and the wrestling angel earlier in his life and more awfully than we were aware of, and that he had become, more grandly than we knew, a prince with God. What a story that 'Sixth Savannah Journal' contains. Fact or fiction?—no romance writer ever awoke human emotion at a deeper depth than this.

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Four volumes have now been issued of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature' (Camb. Univ. Press; 9s. net each). It is time we understood its object and its accomplishment.

The editors, Dr. A. W. Ward and Mr. A. R. Waller, both of Peterhouse, have told us that their interest is not so much in the men of genius, as in the men of aspiration, the men who wrote for immortality and almost missed it. Why should they be interested in them? It is the Christian spirit entering at last into Literature. Carlyle and his hero-worship is out of date. We reverence now

the man and the woman who struck out for the heroic but did not altogether achieve it. And we do well.

But that is only part of the reason. This History of English Literature is to be a record of the work done not only by the men who reached the top, but also by the men who did not reach it, because their work made the work of the few greatest possible. English Literature is a growth, an evolution; it is not an acrobatic series of leaps from Chaucer to Spenser, to Shakespeare, to Gibbon, to Browning, to Meredith. The editors will not neglect the peaks (to change the figure again), but they will explore the whole country as they pass through.

Now this aim is new, and it is well fulfilled. No History of English Literature was ever written that gave so much comparative attention to the English writers who have just escaped oblivion. And by making this an end, and keeping their eyes so firmly fixed upon it, the editors have done us a very great service. Is there the risk of dulness? Well, even that risk was worth running in so good a cause. And the book is not dull. The chapters are reasonably short; they are written untechnically and yet by men of expert knowledge. Within his space a writer has scarce time to begin to be dull. If he does begin, he is at once displaced by another. It is like a game of cricket. But the bowlers here are taken off *before* they lose their sting.

The first volume is *From the Beginnings to the Cycles of Romance*. Of all the cycles of Romance the most entertaining is the Arthurian. The chapter on the Arthurian Legend is written by Professor Lewis Jones of Bangor. It is cleverly written and easy to read. But it should have been longer. Professor Jones has passed lightly over the great ancient controversies. Within his space it was wise to let sleeping dogs lie. But there is more stir when they are awake. In the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* there is an article on 'Arthur and the Arthurian Cycle,' by Professor Anwyl. That article makes deep respond to deep more fervently.

In the second volume (it goes to the end of the Middle Ages) the chapter that has found us most easily is the chapter on the Ballads. Its author is Professor Francis Gummere of Haverford College, in the States. Professor Gummere published a little volume on *The Popular Ballad* in 1907, which was reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. That volume made his choice unmistakable.

What is a ballad? A ballad, says Professor Gummere, is a narrative poem without any known author or any marks of individual authorship, meant for singing, and connected, as its name implies, with the communal dance. Through tradition it has lost its dramatic and choral character and become distinctly epic. It has in many instances even forfeited its refrain, once indispensable.

It is not the idea of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature' to give quotations at any length; but here Professor Gummere quotes the ballad which begins—

> There were three ladies lived in a bower,
> *Eh vow bonnie,*
> And they went out to pull a flower
> *On the bonnie banks o' Fordie.*

and when we read the ballad aloud, putting in the refrain at every verse, as he bids us, we feel the force of the refrain; we see how insipid the ballad would be without it.

The third volume is called *Renascence and Reformation*. In the second chapter there is a short account of the Bible translations that preceded the Authorized Version. It has not the fulness required for the student of the Bible, but it is enough for the student of English Literature.

We have examined the bibliography to this chapter—for the bibliographies are a great feature of the book and occupy much space in every volume. It is a good sound bibliography. *Old Bibles*, by J. R. Dore (not Doré), is a foolish book, not worth naming. Professor Ira M. Price's *Ancestry of our English Bible* should take its place. Lupton's article in the *Dictionary of the Bible* (which should not be called 'Biblical Dictionary') is mentioned, as well as the article on the Continental Versions by Bebb. But Kenyon's really great article on the English Versions in Hastings' Single-Volume Dictionary should now be added. There is one slip: J. L. Mombert should be J. I. Mombert.

While we are on the Bibliographies let us just add that among the works of general reference on Shakespeare might have been included the two great Concordances, Mrs. Cowden Clarke's and Mr. Bartlett's—especially Mr. Bartlett's.

The fourth volume carries the Prose and Poetry from Sir Thomas North to Michael Drayton. One of the earliest chapters is on the 'Authorized Version and its Influence.' The author is Pro-

fessor Albert S. Cook of Yale, who was chosen for this chapter, we imagine, because of the excellent pioneer work he did in his two volumes of *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers*, published in 1898 and 1903. The chapter is not so good as it is filled with good things. Perhaps Professor Cook found the ground too great for the limits of a single chapter. The topics touched are too numerous to be brought into proper relation to one another. All the same, the chapter is well worth reading. The student of the religious contents of the Bible is apt to overlook its literary value. By the reading of this chapter he will recognize that religion and literature go well together—the more religion the better literature.

The chapter on Donne is a masterpiece. It has been written by Professor Herbert J. C. Grierson, of the University of Aberdeen. There is no writer in all the book who has more clearly apprehended the editors' ideas or more loyally realized them; and, in apprehending and realizing them, Professor Grierson has vindicated the wisdom of these ideas. To the ordinary reader John Donne is little more than a name. After the reading of this chapter he will become a possession, just as Spenser or Dryden is a possession. More than that, the chapter is itself literature. Take a single quotation, with its appropriate illustration.

'Donne is most eloquent,' says Professor Grierson, 'when, escaping from dogmatic minutiæ and controversial "points," he appeals directly to the heart and conscience. A reader may care little for the details of seventeenth century theology, and yet enjoy without qualification Donne's fervid and original thinking, and the figurative richness, and splendid harmonies of his prose in passages of argument, of exhortation, and of exalted meditation. It is Donne the poet who transcends every disadvantage of theme and method, and an outworn fashion in wit and learning. There are sentences in the sermons which, in beauty of imagery and cadence, are not surpassed by anything he wrote in verse, or by any prose of the century from Hooker's to Sir Thomas Browne's.'

Professor Grierson thereupon quotes the following single sentence by way of illustration: 'The soul that is accustomed to direct herself to God upon every occasion; that, as a flower at sunrising, conceives a sense of God in every beam of his, and spreads and dilates itself towards him in a thankfulness in every small blessing that he sheds upon her; that soul that as a flower at the sun's declining contracts, and gathers in, and shuts up herself, as though she had received a blow, whensoever she hears her Saviour wounded by an oath, or blasphemy, or execration; that soul who, whatsoever string be strucken in her, base or treble, her high or her low estate, is ever tun'd towards God, that soul prays sometimes when it does not know that it prays.'

COLENSO AND GREEN.

Was there ever a book that so utterly missed its mark as the *Life of James Green*? (Longmans; 2 vols., 18s. net). James Green is described as 'Doctor of Divinity, Rector and Dean of Maritzburg, Natal, from February 1849 to January 1906.' His life has been written by the Rev. A. Theodore Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L. Now Dr. Wirgman is an acknowledged master in the making of books, and he has already made many of them. He undertook the writing of this book for the purpose of exhibiting to the world the greatness and the goodness of Dean James Green. And in order to accomplish that, he had to show that Bishop Colenso was neither good nor great. What he has actually done is to reveal to the world a forbearance and magnanimity in Colenso which the average Englishman can have had no idea of. How could a writer of Dr. Wirgman's experience have made such a mistake? We can account for it only by supposing that his intention was overwhelmed by the facts.

Colenso was appointed to the Bishopric of Natal by Bishop Gray of Cape Town, Metropolitan of South Africa. Arriving in his diocese, he found Mr. Green Rector of Maritzburg, and Rural Dean of Natal. As Bishop's Commissary, Mr. Green 'had exercised full powers of rule over the clergy for some four years. All those powers,' says his biographer, 'were laid down in a most tactful manner, for Bishop Colenso, though from the first he felt a dislike to Mr. Green, never hints a complaint against him on this score.' After ten weeks in Natal, Colenso paid a visit to London. From there he wrote a letter to Mr. Green, commending his zeal, but ending with this significant sentence: 'Would it not be better for you, and happier for both of us, that I should have in the chief pastor of Maritzburg a warm and

attached friend and zealous co-operator in my plans, as well as an adviser and comforter, who would share with me and help to lighten my burdens, instead of increasing them?' Mr. Green at once wrote to the Metropolitan, from whose reply the biographer makes this quotation: 'It appears to me that his (Bishop Colenso's) visit to Natal so far affected him as to lead him to wish to have another, rather than you, as his representative and chief adviser at Maritzburg. My own opinion is that neither of you fully appreciate each other. I think you have quite failed to see the beauty of his character, and the real nobleness of his disposition. He is a most devoted servant of God, and full of love for all that is good, and all good men. If I were to speak of any fault in him, it would be that his naturally sanguine and eager temperament leads him to *do* things somewhat impetuously. He acts, when a cooler and more cautious man would be thinking whether he ought to act.'

Mr. Green did not move. What he did was to set himself more than before in opposition to his bishop, and to use every means of thwarting him in all his undertakings. And as a diplomat Colenso was no match for him.

It is wonderful that, after three years, notwithstanding what Dr. Wirgman calls the uneasy relations between Bishop Colenso and the Rector of Maritzburg, Colenso wrote to Green and offered him the Deanery of the Cathedral. The biographer is surprised into a moment's admiration for the Bishop. 'This kindly and affectionate letter,' he says, 'showed that Bishop Colenso had learnt to value and esteem the Dean's personal worth and character. The Bishop was by nature a warm-hearted and kindly-tempered man.' But the offer and acceptance of the Deanery made no difference in Mr. Green's opposition. He adopted an attitude to the sacraments that was at the furthest remove from that of Bishop Colenso, an attitude which the Bishop of Oxford described as heresy.

If Colenso was impulsive, Green was watchful and determined. Then with the publication of Colenso's books on the Pentateuch he had his opportunity. He presented Colenso for heresy, and had the satisfaction of publicly reading his sentence of excommunication. It is an old controversy now, and no one need have any feeling about it on the one side or the other. Let us thank Dr. Wirgman that he has given us the opportunity of appreciating Bishop Colenso of Natal, although that was evidently far from his intention in writing the book. For we see that Colenso's faults were all on the side of generosity and outspokenness. As for his 'heresy,' he was simply in advance of his day. The nine charges against him, every one of which was found relevant, and upon which he was deposed, contain statements which are found in the works of the most orthodox men of to-day, and they do not contain a single statement upon which a charge of heresy would now be laid against any man. Think of a man being condemned, for example, for saying, 'I cannot any longer maintain or give utterance to the endlessness of future punishments.' Colenso died suddenly on the 20th of June 1883. Dr. James Green lived till the 10th of January 1906.

Dante.

Are Messrs. George Bell & Sons' 'Handbooks to the Poets' as well known as they ought to be? We have an impression that they are not. Mrs. Orr's *Handbook to Browning* is found in a good many libraries, but one rarely sees reference made to Morton Luce's *Handbook to Shakespeare* or the same author's *Handbook to Tennyson*. Perhaps Tennyson does not require a handbook, and Shakespeare has too many already.

The new volume in the series is a *Handbook to the Works of Dante* (6s.). The author is Mr. F. J. Snell, M.A., who tells us that he has studied Dante, as well as the literature on Dante. It is not to be supposed that the publishers would put such a book into the hands of an incompetent. Mr. Snell is quite competent. But so are other ten men whom we could name. What is most distinctive is not the ability of the author, but the construction of the book. Although it is described in the preface as an introduction to Dante's works in general and the *Commedia* in particular, the *Commedia* is not reached until the 269th page. That, we say, is what makes the book distinctive, and that is what makes it useful. For the previous 268 pages are occupied with the things about Dante and Dante's writings which not everybody knows, the things which everybody ought to know. In short, this is really an introduction to Dante, not anticipating the things which we must discover for ourselves in the study of Dante, but to be mastered before we begin that study.

The Idea of the Soul.

The title which Mr. A. E. Crawley has given to his new book, *The Idea of the Soul* (A. & C. Black; 6s. net), looks as if he were taking us by guile, and engaging us in the study of psychology, that most difficult of all the sciences, without our knowing it. And he does engage us in the study of psychology, whether we know it or not. For the first five chapters of the book, which is two-thirds of it, are psychological. Yet Mr. Crawley's interest is not in psychology as a science. His interest is in the belief and practice of psychology over the face of the whole earth. For he is a student of Comparative Religion. His previous books, which have given him no small name in that department, are *The Mystic Rose: A Study of Primitive Marriage*; and, *The Tree of Life: A Study of Religion.* With the issue of the present volume Mr. Crawley will certainly become one of the best known, as he is one of the most accomplished, of the students of that new and fascinating science. It is quite easy to hazard the prophecy that after a little this book will be found practically indispensable both to the student of psychology, for whom it furnishes innumerable practical examples, not the less useful that they are often abnormal, and to the student of Comparative Religion, whom it will introduce to the most perplexing topic with which he has to do.

Hawkins's 'Horæ Synopticæ.'

What are the absolutely indispensable books for the study of the Synoptic problem? They are Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* and Sir John Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticæ.* Of Sir John Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticæ* the second edition, revised and supplemented, has just been published (Clarendon Press; 10s. 6d. net).

It is not altered in essentials, but the whole book has been worked over minutely with the hope, as the author puts it, of supplying some of the 'deficiencies,' and removing some of the 'imperfections,' of the first edition. Also numerous small supplements have been made to many of the lists, and especially to those concerned with the characteristics of the three Synoptists, in order to render them as nearly complete as possible.

One other thing must be mentioned: it will be found more and more characteristic of the best English scholarship. The section which gives an account of the chief source used in the First and Third Gospels outside St. Mark has been very largely rewritten, not because of much change of opinion on the author's part, but *in order to avoid the appearance of a claim to more certainty than has yet been reached on this subject.*

Milton and Liberty.

'Of no phase of liberty did Milton write with such a glow as of that which makes it the correlative of virtue. This idea is one of the great recurrences alike in his poems and his prose works. It is the regnant idea of *Paradise Lost.* Through man's original lapse, true liberty was lost,

> which always with right reason dwells
> Twinned, and from her hath no dividual being.

It is the theme of *Comus*, in whose closing words he gives it a magnificence of expression that lodges it imperishably in the ear:

> Mortals, that would follow me,
> Love Virtue: she alone is free.
> She can teach ye how to climb
> Higher than the sphery chime;
> Or if Virtue feeble were,
> Heaven itself would stoop to her.'

This quotation is taken from a little book, a book of remarkable and timely interest, entitled *Milton and Liberty*, written by the Rev. William Morison, D.D., of Rosehall Church, Edinburgh, (Green & Sons). It is a study of Milton for the student of literature. Much more than that, it is a study of Liberty for the citizen of to-day and to-morrow.

Myths of the Middle Ages.

Myths and Legends of the Middle Ages: Their Origin and Influence on Literature and Art, by H. A. Guerber (Harrap; 7s. 6d. net). This is not a contribution to the science of Mythology. There is no learned research into the 'Childhood of Fiction,' or any scholastic account of a fable's far travel. Mr. Guerber is a popularizer. He re-tells the myths of the Middle Ages, as he has already re-told the myths of Greece and Rome and the myths of the Norsemen, for easy reading at the fireside; and his publishers make his books yet more popular by inserting into them a large number of full-page illustrations from celebrated works of art.

The Unspeakable Scot?

There is no preface to this posthumous book by Dr. John Watson, which is called *The Scot of the Eighteenth Century* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). That is wise. For a preface might have been an apology. It is reading that is pleasantly unpleasant. Racy and anecdotal, it is altogether pleasant if you are a Moderate or do not care. But if you are an Evangelical? Well, even among the Evangelicals there is one wholly attractive figure, and we shall quote the description of him. It is Fraser of Alness.

'He is the only one of those Highland eighteenth century worthies who has achieved fame as an author, and he was a man of profound and intelligent piety. His power in searching the heart and awakening the conscience was so great, and his calling was so distinctly that of John the Baptist, that many people awakened under his preaching, and looking for comfort, used to go to a neighbouring parish to hear the Gospel. Mr. Porteous, its minister, spoke to Fraser about the matter, and besought him "not to withhold their portion from the people of the Lord, which you can dispense to them as I never could." Fraser's reply deserves to be placed on record, as an instance of humility and brotherly love. "When my Master sent me forth to my work, He gave me a quiver full of arrows, and He ordered me to cast these arrows at the hearts of His enemies, till the quiver was empty. I have been endeavouring to do so, but the quiver is not empty yet. When the Lord sent you forth, He gave you a cruse of oil, and His orders to you were to pour the oil on the wounds of broken-hearted sinners till the cruse was empty. Your cruse is no more empty than is my quiver; let us both then continue to act on our respective order. As the blessing from on high shall rest on our labour, I will be sending my hearers with wounded hearts to Kilmuir, and you will be sending them back to Alness rejoicing in the Lord." Overcome by this beautiful reply, Porteous said, "Be it so, my beloved brother"!'

Marcus Dods.

Professor H. R. Mackintosh did a deed of true filial piety when he gathered together and edited this volume of sermons by the late Principal Dods. The title is *Christ and Man* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). At the end of the volume there is published the address on 'The Work of the Ministry' which Dr. Dods delivered at the close of the session, March 28th, 1907. From which take this characteristic quotation:

'Lessing, in a plaintive letter to his brother, says, "Of all pitiful creatures I believe the most pitiful is he who must work with his head, when he is not conscious of having one." But there is a more pitiful creature: and that is he who must work with his soul, when he is not conscious of having a soul. It is this that is pictured by Thackeray in one of the most terrible passages in English literature. He shows us the magnificent genius of Swift, torn by his own scepticism, poisoned by the cassock he had assumed, strangled in his bands, dying at last, as Swift himself says, like a rat in a hole. "What a night it was," says Thackeray, "what a lonely rage and long agony, what a vulture that tore the heart of that giant! . . . One hardly anywhere reads of such a pain." That is true. All imagined tragedies fall short of the actual. One hardly anywhere *reads* of such a pain; but in lesser men than Swift a life of torture results from entering the ministry with selfish motives or unconquered sin. There is no happier life than that of a minister who is truly Christ's servant delighting in the service; none much more miserable than that of him who cannot "lose his life" for Christ's sake, but is still seeking recognition, applause, comfort for himself; who knows the purity demanded of those who represent the Holiest, but who still carries with him into the most sacred services a sin against which he has not the heart to take final measures of extinction.'

The Book of Friendship.

The Book of Friendship (Jack; 6s. net) is a collection of essays, poems, maxims and prose passages from authors ancient and modern, selected and arranged by Mr. Arthur Ransome. Many are ancient enough to be out of copyright, and we may find them for ourselves. But here they are brought together so that the one illustrates the other and each gets benefit from the illustration. And they are printed in a beautiful type on pure white paper with broad luxuriant margins. Some of them are copyright. Mr. Ransome has had to get liberty to reproduce them; and one of them at least has never been published before. We shall quote one of the shortest, a poem by Mr. W. B. Yeats, in which 'the poet pleads with his friend for old friends.'

Though you are in your shining days,
Voices among the crowd
And new friends busy with your praise,
Be not unkind or proud,
But think about old friends the most:
Time's bitter flood will rise,
Your beauty perish and be lost
For all eyes but these eyes.

Theism and the Christian Faith.

Are there any marks by which we may distinguish Christianity from other religions—marks that are unmistakable and unmistakably superior? Perhaps, however, we should first ask what it is that marks superiority in a religion. And that is another way of asking, what is a religion for? The best religion is that which fulfils the end of religion best.

Dr. Everett says that the aim of religion is to heal the breach that exists between man and his environment. Environment is a good word. It includes God. It includes our own particular definition of God. Now there is such a breach, and many attempts have been made to heal it. The attempt has been made through sacrifice, and in a negative sense through retribution. When Christianity came it was differentiated from all the religions that preceded it by these four marks. In the first place, it was a religion without the rites of sacrifice. Secondly, whereas in the classic religions, especially the elements of fate were present, in this religion we find instead a recognition of providence. Thirdly, suffering, hitherto looked upon as one of the chief elements in the breach, is now accepted and glorified. Finally, death, which has been feared as the great enemy of man, is welcomed with joy.

After the death of Professor Everett, the Faculty of Harvard undertook the publication of his Divinity Lectures. There were three courses. The first course was published in 1902, under the title of *The Psychological Elements of Religious Faith.* The second is perhaps not to be published. The third course has now been published, under the title of *Theism and the Christian Faith* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). In the first course Dr. Everett dealt with the psychological roots of religion which he found in the feelings appropriate to the three ideas of truth, goodness, and beauty. In the third course he unfolds the philosophical implications of these three ideas in a doctrine of God as Absolute Spirit, and of Christianity as the absolute religion.

The first question therefore is, What is God? 'A definition of God that has been commonly given,' says Dr. Everett, 'describes Him as a Perfect Being with infinite attributes. My own definition would be precisely the opposite of this. I should describe God as an Infinite Being with perfect attributes.'

The next question is, What is religion? We have already seen what Christianity is. Towards his definition of religion Professor Everett works up slowly. He arrives at this at last: 'Religion is the Feeling toward a Supernatural Presence manifesting itself in Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, especially as illustrated in the life and teaching of Jesus and as experienced in every soul that is open to its influence.'

Professor Everett must have been a delightful lecturer. For he was an original thinker, as well as a lucid emotional writer. It is a wonderful thing that this magnificent volume could have been produced from his students' note-books. There was nothing else to go upon. We should have missed one of the pleasures of our life if we had not had the opportunity of reading it.

Hort's 'Epistle of St. James.'

In the year 1860, Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort planned a Commentary on the New Testament. To Hort was assigned the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter and St. Jude. After a brief period of work on the Gospels, of which only a few unimportant fragments remain, Dr. Hort set to work on St. James. He wrote a commentary on the text as far as the seventh verse of the fourth chapter, but he never finished it. That commentary is now published, together with an introduction which was prepared for a course of lectures in 1889, the whole being edited by Dr. J. O. F. Murray (Macmillan; 5s.).

In the Introduction Hort comes to the conclusion that the Epistle was written by 'James the Just, bishop or head of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord as being son of Joseph by a former wife, not one of the Twelve, a disbeliever in our Lord's Messiahship during His lifetime, but a believer in Him shortly afterwards, probably in connexion with a special appearance vouchsafed to him.'

The commentary, so far as it goes, is very full, and no doubt very rich, though we have not yet had time to test it thoroughly. In 1^{17} Hort insists upon expressing the difference between the two Greek words, but uses 'giving' and 'gift,' instead of the 'gift' and 'boon' of the R.V. The true interpretation he finds in Erskine's *Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel.* He approves of Erskine's paraphrase: 'There are no bad gifts, no bad events; every appointment is gracious in its design and divinely fitted for that design.' His own rendering is 'every giving is good and every gift perfect from above, descending (as they do) from the Father of lights.'

Forms.

In the *Directory and Forms for Public Worship*, issued by the Church Worship Association of the United Free Church of Scotland (Macniven & Wallace; 2s. 6d. net), two ideals are combined. 'Presbyterian Forms of Service' presented the one ideal, 'A New Directory for the Public Worship of God' the other. The one ideal is to offer exemplary services, the other is to offer material and suggestion for services. Perhaps the combination is best. But of the two separate ideals we have always thought the United Presbyterian one was the better.

The Survival of Man.

There is psychology and there is psychical research. The one is a science, depending on facts and proceeding by the usual methods of induction and deduction. The other is make-believe; it depends on the lack of both facts and faith; it is an occasional diversion to a few unoccupied men and a large number of unoccupied women.

The whole story of Psychical Research, what it is and what it has failed to do, will be found in Sir Oliver Lodge's new book, of which the title is *The Survival of Man: A Study in Unrecognized Human Faculty* (Methuen; 7s. 6d. net). There is nothing in it. There are plenty of words, plenty of long words that hold their heads high and make pathetic pretence of being something, words like 'thought-transference,' 'clairvoyance,' 'habitability,' 'cross-correspondence.' But they are only words, as many-syllabled as the name Melchizedek, and as independent as he is said to have been of all human relationship.

Now it is not to be said that we have any ill-will to Psychical Research. Who would have? Do we not humour it with capitals, the savoury meat that it loves? But we must express surprise that men and women can persist in the pretence that there is anything in it, or that there is ever in the least likely to be anything. Moreover, the atmosphere of it is certainly not invigorating.

Turn to the chapter in Sir Oliver Lodge's book on Prevision. There is hope in turning to it. Have we not all a lurking belief in second-sight? And has it not some far-away kinship to such a very respectable subject as Hebrew prophecy?

What do we find? A case is quoted of an engine-driver in America who had a dream in which he saw his engine go over an embankment. He told the dream to a lady ('now dead'); and it came to pass that his engine went over an embankment. Was he not interviewed in America by an agent of the S.P.R.? And then there is a complicated and puerile case of automatic writing by Mrs. Verrall of Cambridge, with insignificant names and unrelated incidents, half of which turned out wrong. All this is told at interminably solemn length. And that is all.

And what is hoped for? Proof of the continued existence of the departed? Job knew that, two thousand years ago, unless we have mistranslated him. And what good did it do him? Of itself it did him no good. But 'I know that my Redeemer liveth'—he found good in that.

'The Spiritual Combat.'

When the Bishop of Belley asked St. Francis de Sales who had been his director, he pulled out of his pocket *The Spiritual Combat*, and said, '*Le voilà!*' So *The Spiritual Combat* is a very proper addition to make to Methuen's 'Library of Devotion.' The editor is the Rev. Thomas Barns, M.A., Vicar of Hilderstone, a great student of lore and folk-lore, who has made the translation from the Italian himself, using for that purpose the Turin edition of 1904. He has also written notes and an introduction, all showing minute, loving knowledge of this devotional classic, and a mind made up on the authorship (Methuen; 2s.).

Bishop Howard Wilkinson.

Messrs. Mowbray have published another volume of sermons by the late Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews, under the title of *The Heavenly Vision* (5s. net). If this means that the first volume did

well, it is an encouragement to preachers to publish their sermons, provided their sermons are free from all tricks of oratory and efforts after effect. Bishop Wilkinson's sermons have Christ as their subject, and sincerity as their motive; and that is all. They have scarcely ever even an anecdote.

It was Dr. Wilkinson's lot to have to preach for some years to the very wealthy. There is no class on earth so difficult to preach to, so strong is the temptation either to preach at them or not to preach at all. It is in one of these sermons that this anecdote occurs. Wilkinson is showing how hard it is for those who have riches to enter the Kingdom, and he says: 'Some fifteen years ago, one who has long since departed out of this life, but who then occupied the leading position (I might say) in London, second, I think, only to Royalty, said to me this: "Do you not see, Mr. Wilkinson, how almost impossible it is for me really to wish to go out of this world, for I have everything to make me love this world?" Now contrast that with another man, who spoke to me some ten years ago. It was late in the evening, in my old parish of Windmill Street, and I had been preparing him for Confirmation. And as I looked at his face, I saw the eye all glazed, and evidently the man was not attending to what I said. And I asked, "Are you ill?" He replied, "No, sir, I am not ill." I said, "What is the matter?" He answered, "I only feel a little faint, sir; for I have been about yesterday and to-day to see about work, and I have only had a cup of tea yesterday and to-day, and I feel a bit faint."'

Infallibility.

The Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, who will be remembered as the author of a great article in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* on the Resurrection of Christ, has written a book on *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility* (Murray; 6s. net). It is just as thorough, and, we might add, just as original, a study of its subject as is the study of the Resurrection in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, although the two subjects are so far apart. Mr. Simpson must be recognized as one of the very few men who are at home in two departments of study. He is at home in the history of the Church as in New Testament criticism. Moreover, he is a genuine historian. His industry is amazing; he gives chapter and verse for every conclusion that he comes to.

'The Apocryphal Acts.'

Taking advantage of the critical edition of the Apocryphal Acts by Lipsius & Bonnet, Dr. Bernhard Pick of Newark, New Jersey, has published an English translation of the Acts of Paul, the Acts of Peter, the Acts of John, the Acts of Andrew, and the Acts of Thomas, the title of the book being simply *The Apocryphal Acts* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company; $1.25). Dr. Pick has proved by his *Paralipomena* of last year that he is quite competent for this work. His scholarship is matched with enthusiasm. He has taken pains with the translation, as though he were making a new version of the Scriptures. His textual notes are sufficient and accurate. The indexes of Scripture texts and of topics are admirable. To the general subject and to the Acts of each individual he has prefixed a useful bibliography.

It is tempting to discuss the contents of these early Acts, but it would be difficult to condense what Dr. Pick has stated succinctly enough already. It is enough to draw attention earnestly to the volume.

Francis W. Newman.

Memoirs and Letters of Francis W. Newman, by I. Giberne Sieveking (Kegan Paul; 10s. 6d. net). There should have been a biography of Francis Newman long ago, but it should not have been this biography. Apart from being the brother of Cardinal Newman, from whom it is only too easy to disentangle him, he had ability enough and enough experience of life to afford materials for a biography. But now that the biography has been written, it is as nearly as possible everything that it ought not to be.

The chief reason of the failure is that the biographer wants to describe Newman not as he was, but as he should have been. His bare theism is a stumbling-block. As nearly as possible every reference to it is rejected till very near the end. Then there comes a single short chapter entitled 'Francis Newman and his Religion,' which is simply an opportunity to tell us that he died a Christian.

But the whole construction of the biography is at fault. It is divided into chapters according to Newman's correspondents. First the letters of one correspondent are dealt with, then a new chapter and the letters of another correspondent. And so we go over the same ground again and again,

touching on the same public and private events, and never see what Newman is or what he is doing.

It is perhaps a minor mistake that whenever a name occurs the editor treats us as children, and tells us who it is. John Stirling, Mazzini, Horace, Pope, Harriet Beecher Stowe—we are not supposed to know anything about any of them.

And to crown all, the writing is too ambitious. In a letter to Dr. Nicholson, Newman said, 'Do you know, when I saw in the *Illustrated London News* the face of the late lamented Brigadier Nicholson of the Punjaub, I thought it *very* like you. Is he possibly a distant relative?' Upon which we read, 'This remark of Newman's that he saw a strong likeness in "the face of the late lamented Brigadier Nicholson of the Punjaub" to his friend Dr. Nicholson is one of those arresting suggestions which seem to strike sudden light out of the flints of ancestry which whiten the road of life along which we have come.' A few pages further on we have a slipshod sentence like this: 'Certain of our own words own patronymity from the Arabic languages.'

The Greek Genius.

Professor Mahaffy of Dublin delivered the Lowell Lectures in Boston last winter, and they have been published by Messrs. Putnam of New York and London. The title is, *What have the Greeks done for Modern Civilisation?* (10s. 6d. net).

What have they *not* done? Supreme in poetry and prose, in architecture and sculpture, in painting and music, in grammar, logic, mathematics, and medicine, in politics, sociology, and law, in philosophy and theology, they are also supreme in science; for though they did not discover the powers of steam or electricity, they nevertheless carried out in mechanics works that no modern builder, with all his vaunted control of nature, has yet equalled.

Is it wonderful, then, that Professor Mahaffy should kick against the modern tendency to depreciate the study of Greek? How thankful he was when he went to America to discover that he had been misled as to the completeness of this degradation of Greek, and that 'a proper college education,' was likely again to replace the 'bread-and-butter studies' in the earlier years of all good courses of training. So thankful was he that he was melted into admitting that the teaching of Greek must be reformed. 'It must be made a human and lively study, taught like a modern language by dictation and recitation, as well as by written composition and reading of authors.'

What is it that we owe to the Greeks? Above everything else, thinking. 'The Greeks were the fathers of modern thinking'—these are Professor Mahaffy's words. For they raised nearly all the puzzles that perplex us still. They raised, but did not solve them. And no doubt Professor Mahaffy is right in saying so. For if you turn to Calkins's *Persistent Problems of Philosophy*, you will find that the Greeks were aware of every one of them, that they started most of them and sent them on the road of their persistence.

Professor Mahaffy, being an old man and garrulous, has many remarks to make by the way. But all the *obiter dicta* only serve to make a captivating book more captivating.

St. Paul in Pictures.

The R.T.S. has reprinted Dean Howson's *Scenes from the Life of St. Paul* (3s. 6d.). The purpose of the reprinting is to give the opportunity of replacing the original illustrations, which were commonplace, by new illustrations, the work of Mr. Harold Copping, which are really artistic, and reproduced in the very best style of modern coloured printing.

Calvin.

Four studies in *Calvin and the Reformation*, originally contributed to the *Princeton Theological Review*, have been republished in one volume (Revell; 5s. net). Their authors and particular titles are these: (1) Calvin—Epigone or Creator, by Émile Doumergue, Dean of the Free Theological Faculty of Montauban; (2) The Reformation and Natural Law, by August Lang, Privat-Dozent in the University of Halle-Wittenberg; (3) Calvin and Common Grace, by Herman Bavinck, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Free University of Amsterdam; (4) Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, by Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Charles Hodge Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton Seminary. Together they make a handsome volume, and the students of Calvinism (who seem to be on the increase, whatever may be said of its adherents) must on no account neglect it. Each essay is a

thorough study of its own particular topic, and is well furnished with notes of reference.

Christianity in Japan.

Among the books this month there is a history of Roman Catholic Missions in China. It should be compared with this book. This is *A History of Christianity in Japan* (Revell; 2 vols., 15s. net). The first volume is occupied with the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox missions. And although the book is written by a Protestant missionary, the Rev. Otis Cary, D.D., the work of the Roman Catholic missionaries is described without partiality and without hypocrisy. Says Dr. Cary: 'The honest historian cannot conceal the faults of those concerning whom he writes. Cromwell's face must be painted with the wart. The artist need not, however, write beneath the picture: "Please notice especially the wart"; and so I have not specifically drawn attention to what seem unfortunate features in the methods of any Christian workers, but have simply told the facts, usually in the words of the workers themselves, or in those used by writers belonging to the same communion.'

Dr. Cary has not the grand style. He has not the style of language affected by the historian who takes himself very seriously. But he has the grand conscience. He has the conscience of the Christian. All he writes he writes as 'ever in the great Taskmaster's eye.'

Our interest, our Christian interest, is more in the future of Japan than in her past. What is Christ to do for Japan in the days that are to come? But Dr. Cary answers our inquiry by pointing to the past. It is Christianity, he says, that has made Japan what she is. It is Christianity that will make her better. He quotes from a pamphlet by Dr W. E. Griffis, entitled *Christ the Creator of the New Japan.* Says Dr. Griffis: 'I could never imagine Bushido of itself alone, or Japanese Buddhism, or Shinto, or the Government, originating a Red Cross, a Peace Conference, a system of hospitals, a Woman's University, the emancipation and elevation to citizenship of pariahs and outcasts (*eta* and *hinin*), freedom of the press, the granting of full toleration of religion, or securing of real representative political institutions. In scarcely one of those features in the New Japan most admirable to Christians or to the best men of the Occident, do I recognize the legitimate offspring of Bushido or forces inherent in Japan. These have been propagated, not developed from within. No, it is to the Spirit of Jesus that we are to accredit most of what is morally superb in the New Japan.'

The Catholic Church in China.

The Rev. Bertram Wolferstan, S.J., has written a History of *The Catholic Church in China*, from 1860 to 1907 (Sands; 10s. 6d. net). The book is a trifle polemical for our taste. Mr. Wolferstan is not so much a historian as an apologist. Of actual history there is, in fact, very little throughout the volume. The book has been written to prove not what the Roman Catholic Church has done and suffered in China, which would have made a book worth reading, but that the Roman Catholic Church alone has the right to preach the gospel in China. The preface to the volume is a sermon on the text, 'By what authority doest thou these things? And who gave thee this authority?' (Mt 21^{23}). That the authority to preach the gospel anywhere belongs to the Roman Catholic Church alone is proved in six propositions, the first of which is that to Her—and to Her alone—in the persons of the first Apostles, was the Divine command addressed, 'Go, teach all nations.'

Now it is worth noticing that the text of this sermon consists of words which came from the lips of the Pharisees; and in reply to them Christ appealed to the individual conscience. The Pharisees wanted the authority of an organization, just as Mr. Wolferstan wants. But Christ ignored such authority, and demanded that every man should recognize his own responsibility and act accordingly.

The book is written in the interests of unity. But the kind of unity it advocates is a kind that we often see advocated now—the unity which obtains when all other Christian communities are swallowed up in mine or pushed over the cliffs. How gladly would we have recommended the book had it really contained a history of the Catholic Church in China. Such a history ought to be written by a Catholic, and the publishers of this volume are enterprising enough to find a Catholic yet who can do it.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson.

The Right Hon. George W. E. Russell had evidently as easy as he had a pleasant task set

him when he was appointed to write the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d. net). The volume is practically a transcript of Sir Wilfrid's diary. There is an occasional historical note by the editor; and at the end there are some extracts from the scanty writings which Sir Wilfrid left behind him. And that is all.

But it does not matter what the editing of the book has meant. There it is, and it is without question the most delightful biography of the season. It is the biography of a delightful man, high-minded, wholesome. It is the biography of a man who had an ideal of duty to live for, and lived for it,—lived for it through innumerable disappointments, rebuffs, and even much ridicule. Yet so far from becoming soured or one-sided, the years of hope deferred only revealed more clearly the breadth and beauty of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's character.

He was much saved, of course, by his sense of humour, a sense which he had in abundance, perhaps superabundance. And the memoir is a plentiful record of it. He speaks of the Tichborne Case. A certain woman was told that the claimant was only an impostor, to which she replied, 'What if he is an impostor, is that any reason why he should be kept out of his rights?'

The humour is certainly sometimes exuberant—'Dr. Temple, when Bishop of London, went down to speak on temperance at Exeter, and in illustrating his subject happened to say, "I never was drunk in my life." Whereupon the posters which came out next morning, announcing the contents of the newspapers, contained the headline, "Startling Statement by a Bishop."'

But sometimes it is not grotesque, perhaps it is not meant to be humour: 'It was during this recess that the Prince of Wales all but died of typhoid fever. His recovery was hailed with delight, and later we had a Public Thanksgiving for it. I remember a great ecclesiastic (I think it was the Dean of Carlisle) saying that the Prince recovered as an answer to Prayer. One of his grooms, however, died of the fever, and one felt sorry that no one prayed for him.'

There are specimens also of his versification. This is sufficiently characteristic. The Duke of Westminster, being ill, asked Lord Cork to move his motion in the House of Lords for the appointment of a Committee on Intemperance:

Said the Duke to the Earl,
'A Committee I want
This horrible drinking to throttle,
And you, my dear Cork,
Are the very best man
I can think of for stopping the bottle.'

So the Earl did the business
Without idle talk,
And moved the Committee instanter;
And all of them said
They were thankful to Cork
For thus helping to stop the decanter.

Judas.

Archdeacon Wilberforce has published a volume of sermons on the first principles of Christianity, though the title is *The Power that Worketh in Us* (Elliot Stock; 3s. net). Now the first of the first principles of Christianity is repentance. And when Archdeacon Wilberforce is explaining repentance, he comes to the case of Judas. There is a sorrow of the world, he says, that works death. But what death? Not always eternal death. Sometimes the death of self. And then he remembers Judas.

For Judas is the favourite example of the repentance that works death. But 'are you prepared to say,' asks Dr. Wilberforce, 'that there was no working of the Divine Spirit in the repentance of Judas? First, "he came to himself." He recognized, in all its horror, what he had done; the unspeakable anguish of realization was permitted to scorch his soul. He is convicted of sin. "I have sinned," he says. Conviction of sin never comes but through the Spirit. He vindicates the one he had wronged. "I have betrayed innocent blood." He makes public confession; he makes immediate and total restitution; and now, perhaps, comes the weak point, because it indicates absence of hope, though even here there is an unexpressed verdict of tacit approval from all humanity: "He went and hanged himself."'

But is there not something else? Is it not said that 'he went to his own place'? 'Yes,' answers Dr. Wilberforce, 'where we shall all go.'

But is there not something yet? Is it not said, 'It were better for that man if he had never been born'? Dr. Wilberforce answers here that the exact translation of the Greek is, 'It were better *for Jesus* if Judas had never been born.'

Dr. Horton's New Book.

Dr. Horton's new book is called *Great Issues* (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is itself a great book, and with it we are presented with an excellent portrait.

The great issues are: Myths, Religion, Morality, Politics, Socialism, Philosophy, Science, Theology, Literature, Art, Life, Death. Every one of them could occupy a volume, or even a library. Dr. Horton does not dream of exhausting any one of them. He does not even attempt to say systematically what he has to say upon any of them. He does not occupy the pulpit or even the platform. He sits down beside us, possibly at the parlour fire, more probably in the study, he and another only, face to face and eye to eye. And on every one of these subjects he tells quite frankly what is most surely believed by himself.

Now, Dr. Horton is neither ignorant nor insincere. Those who read this book will know what he does actually believe on every one of these great issues, and they will know that it is worth believing. And then how graceful a pen he has! With what deftness of finger he touches the spot that thrills. And how unassuming he is! With how sweet a reasonableness does he persuade us at last to the prospect of seeing Him as He is, and to the Companionship by the way.

The Ethics of Progress.

There is a book for which there must be many readers on the other side of the water, so often is it published. It is the book that in short chapters, and in essay form, treats of success and failure within an ethical and sometimes religious atmosphere. Such a book may have been suggested by Emerson. It is nearly always an endeavour to pass beyond Emerson spiritually.

The latest book of this kind is a volume by Mr. Charles F. Dole on *The Ethics of Progress* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net). Its chapters are short, as we say—on an average, six pages. Eight or nine short chapters make up a part. Altogether there are seven parts and sixty-three chapters in a volume of 400 pages. Every chapter has a catching title, and the language is simple, popularly scientific, and anecdotal. So Mr. Dole does not worry his readers with Systematic Theology or systematic anything else. He does not worry his readers with anything. We may feel that other titles would have done for the chapters, and even that another title would have done for the book. But what does it matter? We read the book, and all the while we read it we receive gentle encouragement to do better.

Pascal.

We hear that a study of Pascal is about to appear, written by Viscount St. Cyres, the man of all men most competent to write it. It has been forestalled, but not made superfluous, by a volume entitled *Blaise Pascal: A Study in Religious Psychology*, of which the author is Mr. Humfrey R. Jordan, B.A. (Williams & Norgate; 4s. 6d. net). We have read Mr. Jordan's book from beginning to end, and it was probably written to be read. But it might have been written so as to be read with more pleasure. The style is uncomfortable. Mr. Jordan has a curious habit of saying a thing by two negatives instead of a positive. Besides, he is somewhat out of touch with his subject, out of touch with Pascal himself, and still more with Pascal's religion. Not that he is in open opposition to either. If he were, his book might be more agreeable reading. He is simply lukewarm. And the lukewarmness does not seem to be scientific detachment; it seems to be inherent unresponsiveness. But in one respect Mr. Jordan has excelled. He has told the dramatic incidents, such as the rediscovery of Euclid, quite dramatically.

Children's Books.

A. & C. Black.

Messrs. A. & C. Black still hold the lead in colour printing. And they are as ambitious as they are successful. They have a volume this year called *The Children's Book of Art* (6s.), in which there are reproductions of some of the great Masters—reproductions which are themselves great masterpieces. And these pictures are described with a sympathy and a vividness which are bound to commend them to the interest of intelligent children. For any child to go to a picture gallery after reading this book is to get some good of the picture gallery.

There are fewer pictures in colour in *The Children's Book of Gardening* (6s.). There are only twelve, indeed, but they

are exquisite. If there are fewer illustrations, there is more reading, and it is exquisite also. To give this book to a young person is to give at the same time an interest in gardening that will remain through life.

The Book of the Railway (6s.) contains no fewer than twenty-three illustrations, all in colour as before. The author is Mr. G. E. Mitton, and the illustrator Mr. A. Stewart. It is a book for a railway journey. It will make the journey short and profitable.

NELSON.

For girls of about eleven or twelve the best book of the season, so far as we have seen them, is *Kitty Trenire*, written by Miss Mabel Quiller-Couch (2s. 6d.). If the reading of stories ever does good to girls, this book will do good to the girls who read it. And they will read it not because it is likely to do them good, but because it is such good reading.

Messrs. Nelson have also a boys' book—a remarkably cheap book for its size and its good looks. It is *The Chancellor's Spy* (2s.), by Tom Bevan, and takes us back to the days of Henry the Eighth and Cardinal Wolsey, but the chief figure is Wolsey's successor, Lord Chancellor Cromwell. It is an historical novel. Many great names come into it quite familiarly. And we think the historical probabilities have been attended to. But apart from that it is a good sound story.

Then there are two books for anybody and everybody. First, Miss Charlotte Yonge's *Book of Golden Deeds*—a beautiful volume in handsome quarto, with full-page illustrations in colour and many charming woodcuts in the margin. This is the cheapest book of the month (6s.).

Next, *A Book of Wild Things* (3s. 6d.), compiled by Lucy Lyttelton. The pictures are from Japanese artists, and they have been as beautifully reproduced as they are beautiful—marvels of art and of cheapness. The prose writers as well as the poets have been called upon for the quotations, and the whole range of English literature has been ransacked.

MACMILLAN.

The story of *The Little Merman* (3s. 6d.) is very clever, and it is very nice. How easy it is for a merman to get legs, and how difficult to get a soul—that is the moral of it; and how applicable it is all round. The story is so touchingly told that every little merman who reads it will want to have a soul, but of course he must get rid of all his fishiness first. There is another story in the volume, but we are keeping it for another occasion.

SEELEY.

Two fat volumes have been issued by Messrs. Seeley in that beautiful binding for which they beat all their rivals. There are coloured illustrations in one of them, but that is not the line along which Messrs. Seeley have gone yet. Their field, apart from the binding in which, as we say, they are unrivalled, is science and literature. And here we have a volume of each.

The science volume contains stirring records of the bravery, tact, and resourcefulness of the founders of the Indian Empire. Its title is *Heroes of Modern India* (5s.), and its author is Mr. Edward Gilliat, M.A., who was once a master at Harrow School. Mr. Gilliat has unearthed some of the less-known Indian heroes, such as Sir Alexander Burnes, and he has told their story effectively.

The volume with the coloured illustrations is an addition to Mr. A. J. Church's famous series. This time Mr. Church has gone to Spenser's *Faery Queene* for his stories. Probably it is the most difficult quarry he has ever tried to work, and only his experience and determination could have worked it successfully.

CULLEY.

Mr. Culley has sent out three of his square little shilling volumes, with their pictures in colour—*Moses*, *St. Francis*, and *The Magic Nine Pin*.

He has also published two shilling stories by Nell Parsons—half scientific and half mythological. The one is 'Dawn's Wood,' and the other 'Sunshine's Garden.' They are beautifully printed and illustrated. The two, with the addition of a third story, 'Twilight's Field,' are also bound in one quite handsome volume, which goes by the title of *From Dawn to Twilight* (2s. 6d. net).

FROWDE AND HODDER & STOUGHTON.

Messrs. Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton make a strong publishing combination, and they have been successful in securing the services of Mr. Herbert Strang, a strong boys' author. His volume is called *Palm Tree Island* (6s.). It is the story of two lads who were shipwrecked on an island in the Southern Seas, and who came through the most wonderful adventures, perils, and privations. Their resourcefulness is a miracle of nature, and nature was as resourceful as they. There are interesting little woodcuts inserted of the implements and household utensils they made with their own hands, and there are many full-page illustrations in colour. Besides this volume, however, there is *Herbert Strang's Annual* (3s. 6d. net), the strength of which lies in its boisterous humour.

The same publishers have issued a girls' book, *The Conquest of Claudia* (3s. 6d.), by E. L. Haverfield. It is a good story with plenty of good reading in it, and a good moral which is not too obviously intruded.

Then there are three volumes for children of various ages. For the oldest, but distinctly for children, *The Rainbow Book* of coloured stories (1s. 6d. net)—its pictures all the colours of the rainbow and nearly all Japanese. Next, *Sheaves of Gold* (3s. 6d. net), a volume of stories from the Old Testament, with rather striking new illustrations.

And last of all, *The White Kitten Book* (1s. 6d. net) for the wee ones, a unique and memorable autobiography.

BLACKIE & SON.

There are many ways of making Christmas books impressive. One way is to increase their bulk. And that process seems to have been going on for a number of years. Now the volumes have become more handsome than handy, but no doubt it is a great thing for boys and girls to receive a good substantial volume into both their hands at once.

There are three volumes for boys. They look as if they had been cut to a pattern, outside and inside. And it is

really not of the slightest consequence which volume is chosen. They are all heroic and they are all dripping with blood-curdling adventure.

Perhaps Captain F. S. Brereton deserves the honour of introducing the list. He has gone, as many a boys' author has gone before him, to the Franco-Prussian War. His book is *A Hero of Sedan* (6s.). And he is a hero. The average schoolboy will follow his fortunes with unflagging interest from the beginning to the end. And as he goes he will learn not a little about the history of the period and the geography of the place.

The other two boys' volumes are by Macdonalds. Alexander Macdonald writes *Through the Heart of Tibet*, and Robert M. Macdonald *The Rival Treasure Hunters* (6s. each). The Rival Treasure Hunters has to do with British Guiana, not an absolutely new field, but fresh enough to be attractive for its own sake. The story is of the usual adventurous favourite, but it is perhaps told in better English than usual.

Mr. Alexander Macdonald has been the better of having Sven Hedin before him. We hope the average English boy will not pronounce the book rot; the adventures are certainly impossible enough to be almost incredible.

But the girls' books are brighter than the boys'. They are very well done indeed, delightfully fresh and wholesome stories. There are two of them—*Saturday's Children*, by Winifred James (6s.), and *Clarinda's Quest*, by Ethel F. Heddle (5s.).

Yet, without gainsaying, the best of Blackie's books this year is *Blackie's Children's Annual* (3s. 6d.)—an old favourite which this time beats itself all to nothing. The story called 'Jock's Stepmother' is alone worth the price of the volume. And there are many other excellent stories and wonderful pictures in colour.

The Life of Faith.

By Professor the Rev. W. W. Holdsworth, Handsworth.

The Issues of Life.

We have seen that the life of love is also a life of faith, that is, a life of fullest communion, the divine analogy of which is to be found only in the depths of the divine nature. We now have (Jn $15^{11\text{-}27}$) what may well be called 'the Issues of life.' Few Scriptures are so full as this. Every phrase is charged with suggestion, and there is not one that is superficial, each carries us to the very centre of things; each introduces us to some elemental phase of life. In such a case it is not easy to concentrate thought upon the salient points of our Lord's teaching. In mountainous regions where every peak is some gigantic upheaval of the earth, it is not easy to pick out the peaks which are highest: the general elevation makes distinctions difficult.

But as we dwell upon the words gradually, we come to see that one or two ideas stand out from the rest, and the first of these is 'the fulfilment of joy.' In the teaching of Christ there is nothing that frowns upon our common human gladness of heart, but there is no mistaking the positive claim that He makes when He tells us that our joy needs for its fulfilment the joy which is peculiarly His own. In speaking of it He uses an expression which is constantly repeated.[1] This fulfilling joy is not that which He Himself feels in any one moment of His experience; neither is it the joy which He has it in Him to create. It is the joy which is of His own nature; that which is so truly His own that if it were removed He would be less in Himself than He was before. There is a joy, as there is a love, which is of the very Being of God. What is that joy? Can we describe its qualities? How shall we recognize it if at some time or other it shall touch our lives to make them glorious? The vine, Christ's chosen emblem, teaches us again. If it fulfils its life in sacrifice, then in some way, which 'in hours of insight' we can dimly see, both the love and the commandment, both suffering and its concomitant joy and peace, belong to, are bound up in, the sacrifice for which Christ stands. Is there any joy in sacrifice? Do we not commonly use the word to indicate pain and loss? The answer will depend entirely

[1] ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμή. This form of expression is one of the most strongly marked characteristics of St. John's Gospel. As distinguished from ἡ χαρὰ μοῦ it means the joy which is essentially Mine,—'that answers to My nature' (Westcott). Moulton, however, quoting Thumb, suggests that this may be a dialectic use peculiar to Asia Minor (*Grammar of N. T. Greek, Prolegomena*, pp. 40, 41).

upon what we mean by 'sacrifice.' If it means nothing but a sense of loss and privation, then, of course, there is no room for joy. But if it means, as it should do, the making life, with all it holds, sacred by holding it in trust for God,—if it means that moved by love we lay upon the altar all that we have, all that we are,—then the perfect joy which goes with every expression of love is ours, and the greater the gift the more perfect the joy, until when we make the greatest gift of all, and life itself is offered up, there comes to us the fulfilment of joy, the joy which Christ embodied in Himself. It will be no wonder when the life is shared that the joy should be the same.

There is another effect of this shared life to be found in the perfect intimacy which is always the unmistakable gift of love.[1] 'I have called you,'—the relation is established for all time,—'I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.' Then, lest the familiarity should breed contempt, the disciples are reminded that this was 'of grace'; 'ye did not choose me, but I have chosen you.' Not servants, but friends, chosen friends of Christ, sharing with Him the 'all things' which He has known from the Father! This is a description of Christian privilege which 'stops the heart beating and the lips are dumb. Can it be true the grace He is declaring?' Let us note that the knowledge here suggested must be the knowledge of a person; for it is that which comes by love. It means communion; it indicates the committing of oneself to another. When the heart of either lies open to the other, and thought and purpose lie clear, and we know the things we have heard.[2] We are familiar with this in the blessed processes of human friendship. Our Lord shows that it is possible for us to realize the same certainty 'in the heavenly places.'[3] We may know that which belongs to Him, even as He knows the many things that belong to the unplumbed depths of the divine nature. Such things are in the gift of love alone. They came to us as the dear pledges of a perfect fellowship. To love even the heart of God lies open, and man may know its contents.

[1] ὑμᾶς εἴρηκα φίλους, where the full force of the perfect will be as indicated.

[2] Cf. Matthew Arnold's 'The Buried Life.'

[3] ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. This phrase, so characteristic of the Epistle to the Ephesians, is explained as 'the sphere of spiritual activities' by the Dean of Westminster.

There follows upon this perfect intimacy conferred by love, this deep vision into the heart of God, another effect of the life we share with Christ, and we indicate this by the phrase, 'effectual prayer.' The question of the efficacy of prayer has given rise to endless discussions, and we cannot pretend to remove here all the difficulties that gather round the subject. But we may at least claim that relief seems to lie along the line of thought which is being followed in these chapters.

Our Lord holds out to us the largest hope. There is no limit to the promise contained in such words as 'whatsoever ye shall ask,' and 'ye shall ask what ye will.' So far as these words go, those who expect a full answer to their largest petition have abundant ground for confidence. But too often we exclude or forget the conditions laid down by Christ Himself. Those conditions are, in the one verse, 'if ye abide in me,' and in the other, 'if ye ask in my name.' Strange as it may appear, the two phrases mean the same. For the 'Name' means in the Bible what we more often call the nature; and it is IN that nature, made one with it, finding our life in it, and abiding in it, that we shall receive whatever we may ask. The words are as true as they are fraught with blessing to the hungry hearts of men. Ever we come with our petitions, sometimes clamorous enough, sometimes too deep for words: sometimes we ask for the little things of life, sometimes we seek those revelations of God to our souls which go beyond all that we can ask or think. But if we truly live our life with Christ, there will be no petition on our lips other than that which is already in His holy will. That which we ask will always be that which He wills, and His will is that which will be done. 'Thy will be done' is the true prayer of our Lord. It is the type of a perfect petition. We offer it too when we pray 'in his name,' when we 'abide in him.' Made one with Him by faith, we bring to Him our many petitions; we spread before Him our lives empty, hungry, aching, passionate; but never once that we may change His mind; rather that we may seek the more perfect fulfilment of His will. In this, as in everything, we make ourselves one with Him, and if we ask in His name our prayer is certain to be answered.

Joy; the intimate knowledge of perfect friendship; the prayer which marks our oneness of will with the Eternal,—these are manifest issues of

that common life for which vine and branch, and generous fruitage stand. Is there any other? Or have we now exhausted the figure? One other indeed there is. It is the 'fellowship of suffering.' In the words which describe the hatred of the world there is no rancour, no bitterness. Christ recognizes that the hatred of the world comes upon Him because He is what He is, and that it is 'for his name's sake.' His concern is not for Himself, but for His disciples. He strives to make them see that a common life means common suffering; that if men have hated Him, they will also hate them, that the servant is not greater than his Lord. Will the answer spring into vividness within them—'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Lord'? that is His one concern. In later days Paul prayed that he might know 'the fellowship of his sufferings being made conformable to his death.'[1] In these words the ardent spirit of the great Apostle recognized how true to the facts of spiritual life were the words of his Master. He knew they were true because they awoke in him the answering desire. He at any rate could say, 'It is enough for the disciple.'

We know the exaggeration of the truth in such teaching. It is not by the flagellations and the hair shirts of other days that we best fulfil the Lord's purpose. He never bids us seek the suffering, the miseries of physical privation, torture, death. But if these things come to us by reason of our relation to Him, if they are true issues of that life we share with Him, then He calls upon us to accept them, to recognize the pain as the inseparable part of the life, 'to rejoice inasmuch as we are partakers of His sufferings,' to 'think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to prove us, for even hereunto were we called.'[2]

This view of suffering, whether it be that which we are called to bear for righteousness sake, or whether it be that which comes to us by way of service, redeems the pain from bitterness. The spirit of complaint, even of self-consciousness, departs from the suffering Christian, and he moves to the life of self-denial to which he is called, or to the actual pain of life, or even to the climax of the hatred of the world and the death it may inflict, with a perfect joy springing up within his heart as he sees that every pain he bears becomes to him the pledge of the reality of that life which he shares with Christ.

In that hour of realized rejection our Lord turns from the weakness of this world's malice and rejection to declare His own power to be manifested presently in the sending of the Spirit of truth, and He calls upon His followers to join that Spirit in bearing witness of Him.[3] The word 'witness,' as used by St. John, is peculiar to him. He uses it of the testimony borne by the Father to the Son, and by the Son to the Father. It stands for 'the absolute coincidence between the will and works of the Father and the will and works of the Son.' In the same way the witness of the Spirit to the Christ, and the witness of His followers, is more the reproduction of the life that is shared than any distant outside testimony that may be borne by word of mouth. And so again, in the closing words of this wonderful chapter, we come upon the idea which runs throughout it, and binds into one great unity the truths that flash out upon us in its words. *One life*, in Him, in us; He the vine, and we the branches. He that abideth in Him beareth much fruit, and every branch that beareth fruit comes under the pruner's knife, and suffers that it may be fruitful. So shall we become His disciples; in joy, in knowledge, in love, and in suffering shall we recognize the life we share with Him, and the reproduction of that life shall be the truest witness which our human can bear to His Divine.

[1] Ph 3^{10}. [2] 1 P 4^{12}.

[3] Jn 15^{27}. The verb should be taken as imperative, as the R.V. indicates. Westcott, however, prefers the indicative.

Contributions and Comments.

John ii. 19.

'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'

The difficulty of this saying of Jesus lies in the fact that the words bear, and were intended to bear, a double sense. To the listeners they meant that Jesus could rebuild the temple of Herod in three days (Mt 27^{40}, Mk 15^{29}): what the Speaker meant by them was that His own 'body' would revive after having lain in the grave for a time sufficient to ensure death having certainly occurred. It is not an adequate explanation to say that Jesus used the word 'temple' in a metaphorical sense: in order that the double meaning may stand, the word for 'temple' must, in the language used by Jesus, have actually borne the two distinct senses. The Greek word *ναός* is in the LXX the regular equivalent of the Aramaic or Hebrew היכל. The original sense of this word is, as we learn from Arabic, 'something colossal,'

then a 'large body,' then 'body' in general, and finally 'large building' or 'temple.'[1] As there is no English word which means both 'body' and 'temple,' this is one of those sayings of Jesus which can be rendered only by a double translation: 'Destroy this temple, body, etc.' That this is the true explanation of the text appears, not only from the necessity of the case, but from the fact that the author is at pains to change the Greek word used for 'temple' from ἱερόν in vv.[14. 15], which never answers to the Hebrew היכל, into ναός, which is its regular equivalent; and it is not without significance that this saying is omitted by Luke, to whom, in its Greek dress, it would be unintelligible. The verb λύειν, in the sense of destroying the temple, comes from Ezr 5[12] LXX B; and ἐγείρειν, as the equivalent of Hebrew הקים or הקים, could be used either of erecting a building, or of raising the dead (Is 26[19]). The saying of Jesus seems, indeed, to be a reminiscence and combination of the two passages just cited. The text is thus an example of the common Oriental figure, Amphibology.[2]

T. H. Weir.

The University, Glasgow.

Cushan-rishathaim (Judg. iii. 7–11).

According to the passage in the Book of Judges, Cushan-rishathaim was a king of Aram-naharaim, who oppressed Israel for a brief period of eight years at some time subsequent to the settlement in Canaan, until he was defeated by Othniel ben Kenaz, the Judean hero. Both the name and the narrative have been freely questioned by most critics; and certainly it is improbable that a king of Aram-naharaim or any other country should have borne as part of his personal name the Hebrew term רשעתים, *risha'thàyim*, 'Double Wickedness.' But I have always thought that the name, in its entirety, had a 'Mesopotamian' sound; cf., for instance, Ashur-rish-ishi, king of Assyria (*c.* 1140 B.C.), and personal names of the age of the First Dynasty of Babylon, like Sin-rish and Aa-rishat. We know how readily in other languages besides Hebrew, foreign words and names are altered so as to become significant to the popular ear. With us, for example, the word 'asparagus' is Greek indeed to the vulgar; so they make it vernacular by calling it 'Sparrow-grass.' Such changes, usually instinctive and unconscious, may also be made intentionally by way of witticism and satire.

2. It is now generally recognized that the O.T. ethnical designation 'Cush' (Heb. כוש) includes at least two peoples, and those widely separated from each other. Here we are concerned, not with an African or a North Arabian, but with a Babylonian Cush. So much is indicated by the mention of 'Aram-naharaim' as the starting-point of Cushan-rishathaim's invasion of Israel. Curiously enough, the Babylonian 'Cush' (cf. Gn 10[8ff.]), called in the cuneiform inscriptions 'Cash' (*Kaššû*; *mât Kaššî*), is mentioned along with (Aram-)naharaim (Assyr. *Naḫrima*) in a letter of Abdi-hiba of Jerusalem as by rights belonging to the Pharaoh's empire (Tell 'el-Amarna Letters, KB v. 181. 31). And we know from the same correspondence that about the middle of the fifteenth century friendly relations subsisted between Callimma-Sin (or Kadashman-Bel), the Cassite ruler of the time, and Amenophis III. The Cassites, who are supposed to have invaded Babylonia from Elam and the Further East, their original home being situate somewhere in Central Asia, dominated the country from the seventeenth to about the end of the eleventh century B.C., or from *c.* 1725 to *c.* 1155, according to Dr. King. On any computation, therefore, the period of the Judges, that is to say, the period of the settlement of Israel in Canaan, falls within that of the Cassite or 'Cushite' domination in Babylonia. Although nothing is known at present of any expedition westward on the part of these Babylonian Cushites, it is quite possible that the story of Cushan-rishathaim's oppression of Israel may preserve an indistinct memory of such an historical episode. At all events, allowing for the modifying influence of popular pronunciation or editorial humour, and remembering that Hebrew Cush may represent Babylonian Cash, we can hardly refuse to admit that the name of Cushan-rishathaim is practically identical with Cashsha-rishat, written Cash-sha-ri-shat, a Cassite woman's name (Ranke, p. 244, n. 7). This may be said to comprise the essential portions of both elements in the Hebraized form of the name; כושן־רשעתים = כש־רישת. The form Cushan may have been intended as a dual, just as much as rishathaim, on the analogy of names like Dothan, Enan (cf. Dothain; LXX, Lat. Dothaim; and Enaim, Enam). It seems possible that an editor, to whom 'Cush' or 'Cushite' was a synonym of 'barbarian' (cf. Nu 12[1], Am 9[7], Jer 13[23], 2 Ch 14[9ff.]), may have added the dual endings in order to suggest the epigram 'Double Cush—Double Wickedness.'

Oxford. C. J. Ball.

[1] See Dozy, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes*; also D. S. Margoliouth's *Chrestomathia Baidawiana*, note 589.

[2] Cf. E. J. W. Gibb, *History of Ottoman Poetry*, i. 113, for examples in Turkish poetry; and Chenery's *Assemblies of Al-Harîri*, p. 177, for Arabic.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Last year, in the month of May, the Hartford Theological Seminary of America reached its seventy-fifth year, and the event has left its mark upon theological literature. In the first place, the *Hartford Seminary Record* for July is filled entirely with the speeches delivered at the celebration of the anniversary. And, in the next place, a volume of six hundred pages has been published containing eighty-three articles, by nearly as many authors, each article giving an account of the work done in some particular department of theological study during the last seventy-five years. The editor of the volume is Professor Lewis Bayles Paton. Its title is *Recent Christian Progress* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net).

It is a volume of greater value than one would have believed it could be. Not one of the authors has ten pages to turn himself in. But the editor has taken care that if the space was small it should be well used. Once or twice a line is lost in the complaint that there are no lines to lose. But for the most part the authors have something to say, and they proceed at once to say it. The article to which we have been most attracted is written by Professor George Ellsworth Dawson. Its title is 'The Psychology of Religion.'

We shall return to that article in a little. But, first of all, let us look at one of the addresses which were delivered at the celebration, and which are contained in the *Seminary Record*. Let us look at the address on 'The Present Task of the Ministry.' It was delivered by President Woodrow Wilson.

Hartford is a theological seminary. President Wilson addressed men who were graduating in theology on the day upon which he addressed them. He addressed them as an outsider and a layman, at once apologizing for his 'touch of temerity,' and at the same time confidently asserting that 'every profession is best estimated from the outside.' And he told them that he knew of 'no more difficult, no more delicate, no more tremendous' undertaking than theirs. It was an undertaking, he said, that would daunt any man who depended on his own strength to accomplish it; and unless these men were going with the conscious support of the Spirit of God, he did not see how they could have the audacity to go at all. For 'we live in an age,' said he, 'when *a particular thing cries out to be done which the minister must do, and there is no one else who can do it.*'

We have thrown the last sentence into italics. When we read it first we did not see the significance of it, and we wish that our readers may see it at once. We did not see that there was more in it than in other sentences, of similar sound, which

simply tell the student of theology that the Christian ministry is the noblest of all professions and he must profess it nobly. We did not see that President Wilson was laying upon the men who are entering the ministry in our day a definite task, a task exceeding in difficulty and in importance that which the Christian ministry has ever before been called upon to execute.

For a change has come over the whole attitude of men to knowledge. There was a time, 'which we can all remember,' when men of science were content with a certain materialistic interpretation of the universe. They were actually content, repeats Dr. Woodrow Wilson, with such an explanation of the universe as was supplied by their own investigations. They knew that other men, some other men, spoke of a spiritual order of things. Their attitude to that order was not defiant. They were simply unconcerned about it. They did not look into such matters because they were convinced that no examination of them would affect their assurance and content with the conclusions regarding the universe at which they had arrived in the pursuit of their own particular studies.

But that time has gone by. Men of science now feel that the explanation which they can give of the universe is a partial explanation. They see that, for the benefit of their own thought, apart from the benefit of their own souls, it is necessary that something should be added to it. They recognize, as they never did before, that their own study is part of a great circle of studies, and that the circle will not be complete when all these studies have been made to fit together, unless a spiritual segment is supplied.

'In other words,' says President Woodrow Wilson, 'we are in the presence of the absolute necessity of a spiritual co-ordination of the masses of knowledge which we have piled up and which we have partially explained, and the whole world waits for that vast task of intellectual mediation to be performed. And he asks, 'Who shall mediate between our spirits and our knowledge? Who shall show our souls the tracks of life? Who shall be our guides, to tell us how we shall thread this intricate plan of the universe and connect ourselves with the purpose for which it is made?'

His answer is, the Christian minister. 'The world offers this leadership, this intellectual mediation, to the minister of the Gospel. It is his if he be man enough to attempt it—man enough in his knowledge, man enough in the audacity and confidence of his spirit, man enough in the connexions he has made with the eternal and everlasting forces which he knows to reside in the human spirit.'

Well may President Wilson say, 'I take that to be a very great and a very difficult task.' But well may he say also, to these men graduating in theology, 'I congratulate you that this is your high and difficult function in life.' For they will not shrink from it if they are persuaded that the task is theirs. Is this the task of the ministry of to-day? The task of the minister of Christ in every age is to preach the Gospel. Is this the preaching of the Gospel?

The question is plainly in President Wilson's mind, though he never gives it such bare utterance. It is in his mind; for he mentions two popular methods of preaching the Gospel, and sets himself against them. The one method is to preach the Gospel by selling the box of ointment and giving it to the poor. The Gospel is for the poor. Dr. Wilson does not, of course, deny that. But it is also and as often for the rich. And he does not believe that the Christian Church should be chiefly a philanthropic institution.

More than that, he doubts if we do not err when we greatly cultivate compassion for the multitude. Jesus had compassion on the multitude, and He did well, for they needed it. But they do not need it now as they needed it then. Now they need to be assured that they have an

inheritance, 'the richest and completest inheritance that it is possible to conceive'; and instead of looking for pity, they must be challenged to assert in themselves those things which will make them independent of pity. Dr. WILSON does not deny, you observe, that the Church stands at the centre of philanthropy. But he asserts that it stands also at the centre of education, at the centre of science, at the centre of philosophy, at the centre of politics; in short, at the centre of all sentient and thinking life.

The other method of preaching the Gospel which Dr. WILSON disallows is the placing of the whole emphasis on rescuing the individual soul from the wrath to come. He understands that the Gospel came into the world to save the world as well as to save individual souls. And he does not think that much of its task is accomplished, or the noblest part of it, when men are merely advised 'to run to cover.' Nay, there is even the risk of making the cross of Christ of none effect by reducing it to an instrument of the most unsocial selfishness.

If we do not misunderstand him, Dr. WILSON accepts pity for the poor and the rescue of the individual as parts of the preacher's task. But he refuses to see his whole task accomplished in them. In actual fact, he says, the pulpit itself has discovered the inadequacy of these two, singly or together, as the fulfilment of the preaching of the Gospel. And to make up the deficiency it has attached to itself musical entertainments and cooking classes and bowling alleys.

What is it, then, that the preaching of the Gospel chiefly signifies? This, in a sentence, that God is a God of purpose, and within that purpose desires to gather all the lawful occupations and interests of life. It is the business of the preacher to gather them all within it.

That God is a God of purpose—that is the first thing. How do we know that? There is a sentence in the record of the Gospel which is able to tell us. It is, 'when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons' (Gal 4^4). 'When the fulness of the time came'—that is God's purpose declared. But if we have learned it otherwise, if we have learned it of Evolution, or left others to learn it of Evolution, is it too late yet to recognize and rejoice in it? Is it too late to make this the great theme of preaching, that it is not the will of our Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones, or any activity of theirs, should remain outside His purpose of grace?

'I wonder,' says President WOODROW WILSON, 'if any of you fully realize how hungry men's minds are for a complete and satisfactory explanation of life? I heard a very pathetic story the other day about a poor woman, a simple uneducated woman, in one of our cities, who had by some accident got hold of one of Darwin's books—I forget if it was the *Origin of Species* or not—and who had found, even to her unlettered mind, a great revelation in the book, a revelation of the processes of physical life and of the plan of physical existence. She told a friend that it had taken out of her—in her expression—"all the kick there was in her." She said: "I don't find anything in the preaching that I hear. It listens good, but it is so soft. It doesn't seem to give me anything to chaw on. It doesn't enable me to understand what happens to me every day any better than I understood it before. It doesn't even put bread in my mouth or in my children's mouths. But I read that book, and I saw that there was something doing. I saw that there was something going on of which I was a little part, and it has taken all the kick out of me."'

The language is occasionally unfamiliar. But behind its unfamiliarity we see a fact. It is the tragic fact that we may have left such an one outside our ministry because we had no word to

preach that made life orderly or even intelligible. We have had much to say about the antagonism between science and religion; we have forgotten that religion is the explanation of science, the lost segment of the circle which all the sciences are looking for. We have spoken carelessly about 'the man in the street,' without asking how it is that he comes to be there, without considering that it may possibly be because, in the words of the American woman, we have 'nothing to give him to chaw on.'

Now there is no denying it that if this is the task of the ministry in our day, the minister needs much equipment of knowledge. Dr. WILSON does not deny it. He calls on these graduates to equip themselves with knowledge. He admits that they cannot be perfectly equipped at the outset. But he looks forward to the time when they will grow in knowledge and in power as they understand the plan of the world and what they are called to do for men.

And this brings us to the question where the knowledge is to be found, and so to the volume we have already been introduced to.

For the knowledge with which the minister must acquaint himself is the knowledge of life. Beyond life, physical, mental, spiritual, he happily does not need to go. And the article by Professor DAWSON on 'The Psychology of Religion' gives the first absolutely necessary directions.

Professor DAWSON defines the Psychology of Religion as the science of the religious life. It is therefore that very lost segment which Dr. WILSON is in search of in order to complete the circle of the sciences. Then Professor DAWSON shows how the segment may be made to fit into its place and finish the complete round.

First of all, in the light of the Psychology of Religion, the science of Biology finds its place. It is no disparagement of the religious life to admit that, as a science, Biology had the start of it, and has even had much to do with its present position. 'Since Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859, human experience in every department of life, and not least in that of religion, has taken on absolutely new meanings and values. The human mind is becoming *biocentric* in its outlook upon every type of experience. There is no other explanation of the changes that are rapidly taking place in literature, art, education, religion, and social institutions. Biology has discovered a new way of looking at things.' There is no harm in admitting all that. The point is that now the way is open for the Christian minister to answer the request of the biologist for a spiritual interpretation of life.

'The processes of cell-conjugation and cell-division,' says Professor DAWSON, 'reveal phenomena for which there is no explanation by any generally accepted standard of knowledge.' It may be that before we are able to furnish this explanation we shall have to modify somewhat our conception of the human soul and God's relation to it. Cellular Biology may react on Religious Psychology. And then there may come a radical reconstruction of religious philosophy. It may be that the revelations of Cellular Biology will be the means of making such a doctrine as the Divine immanence more than a philosophical speculation. But nothing will ever hinder the science of religion from holding the first place among the sciences and being the explanation that binds together and uplifts human knowledge, unless it be the ignorance or the cowardice of those who are now graduating as ministers of the Gospel.

There is just one other science that has to be attended to immediately. It is the science of Anthropology. This science 'investigates man's development racially, as Biology investigates his development as a living being. On the psychical side, it discovers the origin of beliefs, customs, works, and institutions of the various races and levels of civilization. Its investigation of the religious life of the race has created the science of

Comparative Religion; and this science supplies the Psychology of Religion with facts and principles that enable it to derive universal laws of religious development. Thus there have been brought to light the unity of religious consciousness in all mankind; the essential elements of that consciousness; the objects that evoke its activities under the varying conditions of racial environment; the forms these activities take, in ceremonials, sacrifices, worship, and institutions; and the religious sanction of conduct throughout racial evolution.'

And again this science of Anthropology seems to precede and almost to create the science of the religious life. But precedence in time is no mark of superiority in a science. The patriarchs and prophets preceded the early Christians. Yet it was one of the latter who said, 'God has provided some better thing for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.' It is the spiritual interpretation of life, the interpretation which only the minister of the Gospel can give, that makes perfect the whole round of science and philosophy.

Canon Rayner WINTERBOTHAM has contributed an article to the *Expositor* for December on 'The Omniscience of our Lord.' He does not believe in our Lord's omniscience. 'I do not hesitate to avow,' he says, 'that I hold the latter (that He was *not* omniscient) with all the strength of my religious conviction.'

Now it requires no great endowment of courage to make this avowal of unbelief. Canon WINTERBOTHAM does not pretend that it does. It is a well-recognized and widespread attitude to Christ at the present time. It is the attitude of all those to whom Christ, with varying degrees of excellence, was still 'a mere man.' It is also the attitude of many who believe heartily in His divinity. Canon WINTERBOTHAM believes in His divinity. And he uses the word 'divinity' in the sense in which the Church has ever used it.

But if it demands little courage to express one's unbelief in the omniscience of Christ on earth, it requires much circumspection. For it is easy to express it so as to deny Christ Himself. It is easy to express it, and it is now constantly being expressed, in such a way as to deny all that Christ has stood for throughout the history of Christianity, including His true divinity, and to leave Him at best but a degree better than the men we pass on the street.

Canon WINTERBOTHAM is not so careful as he might be. In the first place, he uses a word which is open to misunderstanding. It is the word 'omniscience.' We prefer the word 'knowledge.' We do not say that the Church has not claimed omniscience for our Lord on earth. We do not say that it has. What we say is that knowledge is enough to speak about. The circle may not be lessened nor its centre shifted by the substitution of knowledge for omniscience. But it is a better word to work with. It is more intelligible, it is more easily tested, and it covers the whole of the ground that has to be covered.

In the next place, Canon WINTERBOTHAM does not seem to have considered—certainly he has not made clear—what he means by 'omniscience.' If he means an attribute that is so peculiar to God that it had to be laid aside by the Son of God when He became man, then the question falls. We all believe that He 'emptied Himself.' If the emptying necessarily meant the loss of omniscience, there was no occasion for the writing of this article. The word does seem to be used occasionally in that sense. But the article as a whole shows that this is not the meaning. Canon WINTERBOTHAM admits the possibility that Christ 'knew everything all the time.'

But the most serious oversight is a confusion between the fact of knowledge and the source of it. Canon WINTERBOTHAM does not believe that Jesus knew everything all the time. He believes that He knew only 'what was needful for us men and for our salvation.' But when he speaks of

Christ knowing what was needful for us men and for our salvation, he inserts a parenthesis 'by intuition, experience, or revelation of the Spirit.' And that parenthesis obscures the issue. For the question is not, How did Jesus know? but, Did He know? When the believer in Christ's knowledge comes to the question of the source of His knowledge he may be at one with Canon WINTERBOTHAM. He may even say that the very reason why he still believes in the knowledge of Christ on earth is not, as it used to be put, because He was God and therefore could not be ignorant, but because as the Son He was in perfect communion every day with the Father.

But, once more, is Canon WINTERBOTHAM quite clear on the difference between knowing 'everything all the time' and knowing 'what was needful for us men and for our salvation'? Christ came for us men and for our salvation, and He came for nothing else. Is there anything, then, that He said or did which had any other reference? What is this other 'everything all the time'? And if we see from the records of His life on earth that there were things of which He was ignorant, how can we be sure that these things were not necessary for us men and our salvation?

It is easy to limit the things that are necessary for our salvation. We have seen them limited in our day to a very small number of things, and then we have been told that Jesus was ignorant of all the rest. And not only ignorant of them, but also subject to transgression in respect of them. We have been told pretty freely of late that all that is needed for us men and our salvation is a fairly good example.

We do not say that Canon WINTERBOTHAM is wrong in denying Christ's unerring knowledge, we only call for carefulness. Whether Christ knew or not is a question of evidence. And as a question of evidence Canon WINTERBOTHAM deals with it.

What are his arguments? He finds his arguments in the Gospels and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Gospels there are three passages, or classes of passages. It is said (Lk 2^{52}) that Jesus 'advanced in wisdom and stature.' It is said (Mk 6^{6}) that He 'marvelled' because of the unbelief of the people of Nazareth. And it is said (Mk 14^{33}) that He 'began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled.' Besides these passages there is the statement about the day and the hour, which will be touched upon in a little.

Now we must not begin to explain away these passages. We must not for a moment harbour such a desire. Explaining away has prevented whole generations of men from understanding the Bible. And here at any rate we have no temptation. For Canon WINTERBOTHAM himself quotes just as many texts on the other side. Not only is it stated that Christ 'knew all men,' and that He 'knew what was in man' (Jn 2^{25}), but in His intercourse with men He also showed on various occasions 'an apparent supernatural acquaintance with their circumstances (Jn $1^{47.48}$ $4^{17.18}$ Mt 17^{25}) and their thoughts (Mk 2^{8} 9^{33-37} Lk 7^{40} Jn 6^{61}).' So that what is evident without any explaining away is, that to the Evangelists Christ seemed to know everything that was going on and yet was unmistakably human.

And is not that all we can say about His knowledge? Is it not all we need to say?

But this is not the whole of the evidence. Canon WINTERBOTHAM goes to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he finds it stated that our Lord was 'really and truly one of ourselves,' and that He was 'tempted just as we are.' Is this evidence of want of knowledge? Temptation may be: it would be difficult to prove that it must be. Canon WINTERBOTHAM makes no attempt to prove it. He exclaims, 'But surely, surely, to admit that He was tempted with evil, and at the same time to deny that His knowledge was or could be limited, is to strain out the gnat and to swallow the camel.' Perhaps so.

But 'surely' is never an argument, not even when it is repeated.

It is a remarkable fact that there is just a single passage in the Bible which states explicitly that of anything whatever our Lord was ignorant. And it is significant that of that passage Canon WINTERBOTHAM makes very little. For he knows that it belongs to the eschatological teaching of our Lord, and that the eschatological teaching of our Lord stands by itself and must be treated separately. The passage is Mk 13^{32}, in which Jesus Himself testified that the Son did not know (any more than the angels) the day or the hour of the Second Advent.

The passage, we say, belongs to the eschatological teaching of the Gospels. It is part of Christ's revelation of the future. And there is no doubt that at the present time our Lord's eschatology is more difficult to receive than any other part of His teaching. Canon WINTERBOTHAM is keenly sensitive to the difficulty of it. And in this, at least, he is very far from standing alone.

A new volume of 'St. Ninian Lectures' has been issued. Its title is *Religion and the Modern World* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). One of the lecturers is Dr. James MOFFATT, whose lecture is on 'Modern Criticism and the Religion of Jesus.' In that lecture Dr. MOFFATT quotes Herrmann on the eschatology of our Lord, and accepts the situation as Herrmann explains it. His words are: 'It is certain, as Herrmann puts it, that, once our attention is called to the eschatological standpoint of Jesus, we are compelled to make two admissions. In the first place, we feel that a barrier is raised between Him and us by our having honestly to confess that we do not share that standpoint—we are not very greatly affected by the idea of an approaching end of the world. Secondly, circumstances in which we see the promise of a better future, in His eyes were only harbingers of ruin. In Him there was nothing of the zeal of the political and economic reformer.'

Well, what are we to do with that? We are to accept it and make the best of it, if it is the right word on the subject. We are on no account to twist and torment it in order to extract out of it the meaning we most desire. Is Herrmann's the right word?

The point of difficulty is succinctly and unerringly stated by Canon WINTERBOTHAM. 'It is almost impossible,' he says, 'to resist the evidence that our Lord believed, and led others to believe, that He would come again within a short time.'

Now, in the first place, it is possible, as Canon WINTERBOTHAM admits, that 'the Evangelists misreported Him.' Or, as Dr. MOFFATT more delicately expresses it, there is 'the critical uncertainty as to how far His recorded words have been sharpened in the course of their preservation by the next generation of His disciples.' There is also the possibility, as Canon WINTERBOTHAM again admits, that He did come again within that very generation. But there is something else.

There is the fact that Jesus was a prophet. Being a prophet, He foretold the future. And He foretold the future in such language, or with the use of such imagery, not necessarily as He himself was capable of, as in the case of other prophets, but as would best convey the spiritual facts of the future to the minds and consciences of His hearers.

First of all, He was a prophet. But that needs no proving. Next, being a prophet, He foretold the future. For the latest discussion of this statement, turn to another new book, *The Unfinished Symphony* of the Rev. Hugh FALCONER, B.D. (Duckworth; 6s.). We have for some time been laying much emphasis on the fact that the Hebrew prophet was a 'forth-teller.' Foremost of all, says Mr. FALCONER, he was a fore-teller. And he quotes the great authority of SMEND in

favour of it: 'I take it that Smend is entirely right when he says that "in Amos and his successors prophecy (in the sense of pre-vision) is the starting-point of their whole discourse and action; all new knowledge which they preach comes to them from the action of Jehovah which they foretell. *Consequently the greatness of a prophet is to be gathered from the measure in which he foresees the future.*"'

Now Jesus was the greatest of the prophets. Therefore, if Smend is right, He foresaw the future as no one else foresaw it. And, foreseeing, He foretold it. But He had to foretell it as His hearers were able to receive it. Well, we know something of the men His hearers were; we know something about their upbringing and their outlook; and we may safely conclude that it was not possible for human language to convey to them the spiritual kernel of the teaching without misunderstanding as to its external envelope—its times and its seasons.

But it does not follow that Jesus Himself was mistaken. If we say that He was mistaken, our conclusion is drawn, not from the facts before us, but from other considerations. Dr. Moffatt, confining himself to the eschatological teaching, is able to say: 'We cannot doubt that Jesus Himself must have looked through such forms and beyond them even as He employed them.'

And now comes the significant thing. Why did our Lord say anything about the future if He knew that it would be misunderstood? The answer is that the revelation of the future was His business as a prophet. More than it had ever been the business of any prophet before Him, it was His business to reveal the future. For He had come to make the future. And he could not make it without in some degree making it known. For the making of it was to be, not His own immediate act, but the work of His disciples. And He knew that they would not misunderstand it always.

He knew that they would not misunderstand it always. Did St. Paul misunderstand it? Turn once more to a new book. The Rev. A. L. Lilley has published a volume of sermons on *The Soul of St. Paul* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net). He believes that St. Paul misunderstood. But, he says, 'within the brief period of his ministry St. Paul had abandoned his apocalyptic hope of a visible advent, abandoned it, no doubt, because he had come to feel how much greater than any such magical transformation of the visible order could be, was the silent transformation which from his own experience he knew that the Spirit of Christ was effecting, and would increasingly accomplish, in and through the hearts of men.'

And not only did our Lord know that His words would not be misunderstood always. He knew also that by such teaching as was at first misunderstood, and had to be searched into, that its meaning might appear, had the revelation of God been made from the beginning. Canon Winterbotham has taken us to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Let us detain him there a little. The triumphant chapter is the eleventh, the chapter which contains the Roll-call of Faith. What is it that is singled out as at once source and evidence of the heroic in these heroes? It is the fact that they were ever kept looking for something beyond their present attainment. And when did they at last obtain the fulness of insight and enjoyment of the promises of God? Not in this life. 'These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them and embraced them.' It is the bravest word that this Epistle contains. We think there is no braver or truer word (apart from the words of Jesus) to be found in all the Scriptures.

The truest, we say, as well as the bravest. For Abraham was not misled when he went out to find a country on the other side of the River, though afterwards he learned to look for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God. And if there are 'some rare spirits' among us

still who sing our great hymn of praise, and joyfully say, 'We believe that Thou shalt come,' it does not mean that they are misled. In his new volume, entitled *Christus Crucifixus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), the Principal of the Clergy School in Leeds has no hesitation in joining the small band of expectants. Mr. SIMPSON takes the words of Frances RIDLEY HAVERGAL, 'our modern English St. Cecilia,' and makes them his own; and he knows that as he makes them his own, and that fervently, he is not misled:

Thou art coming, O my Saviour,
Thou art coming, O my King,
In Thy beauty all-resplendent,
In Thy glory all-transcendent;
Well may we rejoice and sing;
Coming! In the opening east
Herald brightness slowly swells;
Coming! O my glorious Priest,
Hear we not Thy golden bells?

In the article in the *Expositor* by Canon WINTERBOTHAM, to which reference has just been made, there is an interesting exposition of a familiar and important verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is the verse, 'We behold . . . Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man' (2^9).

'Crowned with glory and honour'—when? We have held—have we not all held hitherto?—that the crowning took place at the Ascension. Canon WINTERBOTHAM holds that it took place at Pilate's judgment-seat.

'What the author had before his mind's eye was certainly not that "crown of pure gold" with which He was (figuratively speaking) crowned when He sat down at the right hand of God, King of kings and Lord of lords. It was obviously that other crown, of thorns, with which His mother, the Jewish Church, crowned Him in the day of His espousals—when He purchased to Himself the universal Church to be His bride for ever. What the sacred writer saw was Jesus as Pilate led Him forth wearing the crown of thorns and the robe of mockery.' And for proof of it Canon WINTERBOTHAM refers his reader to the original Greek.

And what is the advantage? The advantage is that 'no conceivable "glory and honour" could ever come near to the moral dignity of that supreme self-sacrifice.' It may be that 'all the crowns of empire meet upon that brow' in heaven above. But it is the *moral* splendour, the *spiritual* dignity, of the Redeemer which must hold and fascinate every Christian eye, and that shines out resplendent in the Crucifixion.

Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.

BY THE REV. P. J. MACLAGAN, M.A., D.PHIL., SWATOW.

II.

What is Tao?

THERE are other passages which might be quoted to illustrate the metaphysical meaning of Tao; but I do not know that they would add much to the light or glimmering of light we may have already gained. If, then, we ask what did Lao-tsze mean by Tao, it must be admitted that the answer cannot be very definite. We may almost be inclined to take up Lao-tsze's own words and say, 'How vague! how confused! How confused! how vague!'

It may perhaps help us to notice some of the

various translations that have been given by eminent scholars of this word Tao and its companion Teh. Our Classic, *e.g.*, has been called by Julien, 'Le Livre de la Voie et de la Vertu.' If I may revert to a distinction I have already indicated, 'way' and 'virtue' are rather what the words Tao and Teh may mean than what Lao-tsze means by them. For it is quite true that Tao means 'way,' in the literal sense of a road to be walked on; and in any description of the psychological genesis of Lao-tsze's doctrine, the mental process by which he came to it, this primary meaning of Tao might have to be taken into account. But in translating the Classic, while we might make 'way' fit in with Lao-tsze's practical philosophy, and the use in the New Testament of 'the way' for Christianity is an interesting parallel, we should find it difficult to make it carry for us all the metaphysical meaning that Lao-tsze puts into Tao.

Professor Parker suggests 'providence' and 'grace' as a translation for Tao and Teh. This translation too suits some passages, as, *e.g.*, where we are told that 'the Providence of Heaven is to take from abundance, to make up what is enough' (77, Parker's trans.). But even here 'Providence' may easily suggest to us more of knowledge and purpose than we have any right to attribute to Lao-tsze's Tao. And in other passages 'Providence' as a translation for Tao will not fit at all. We can hardly intelligibly speak of 'possessing Providence' or 'undergoing instruction in Providence' or 'being good hands at Providence' and 'using it to educate the people.' Again, several authorities have suggested 'nature'—*natura naturans*, as they explain, not *natura naturata*, as the equivalent of Tao. Professor Legge demurs, but on grounds that are hardly relevant or adequate. It may be that, as he says, *natura naturans* is a figure of speech, mere barbarous phraseology. It may be that Tao never had such a signification (*i.e.* lexically). But when he admits that the term 'nature' is handy and 'often fits so appropriately into a version,' he has granted probably as much as any one would care to claim. Legge himself shows good reason for declining to translate Tao, and seeking only to associate with it Lao-tsze's ideas. Accordingly following, as he says, chap. 25 of the Classic, he speaks of Tao as 'the spontaneously operating cause of all movement in the phenomena of the Universe.' This, I think, is true as far as it goes. I fail, however, to follow Legge when he goes on to say of this spontaneously operating cause, 'The Tao is a phenomenon; not a positive being, but a mode of being.'

Looking for ourselves at the passages we have had before us, we may say, I think, as much as this. (1) Tao is Lao-tsze's ultimate metaphysical principle. There is no room for any other existence superior to or even co-ordinate with Tao. (2) Tao is the origin of this world of definite things and is immanent in all things, their essence. (There is no means of determining the question which may occur to us, whether Tao is all in the things in which it is immanent, or whether there is unexhausted overplus of Tao not yet coined into visible and tangible objects). (3) Yet Tao is not, or is not only, the indefinite stuff (ὕλη) of which things are the definite modes. It is, if I may borrow the terms, force as well as matter, operative in all that goes on. (4) When we seek to define it, it eludes us; it is the perfect indefiniteness of which nothing can be said; it may be called Pure Being, only inasmuch as it is not inactive it is rather Pure Becoming. (5) It is Pure Being endowed with the apparently inherent tendency to become, or to give rise to, this world of definite things, and then to operate in these things as in fact we find them operating. If it is necessary to venture a translation of these key words Tao and Teh, I would render them by 'spontaneity' and 'spontaneous action.' Lao-tsze himself says, 'Man takes as his law the Earth: the Earth takes as its law Heaven: Heaven takes as its law Tao: Tao takes as its law Spontaneity': or as Legge gives it, 'its being what it is.'

Before passing on to discuss other aspects of Lao-tsze's thought, I should like to pause here, and from the standpoint of the Christian missionary consider what we already have before us. My subject is 'Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.' I shall not delay to point out in detail the defects of Tao as the ultimate principle of existence, its poverty, for instance, as vague and indeed unknowable, compared with the infinite wealth of that spiritual principle whom we call God. It is more agreeable and more profitable to look at what I have called the Christian affinities of Taoism. I begin with this as the most obvious point, that Lao-tsze is in earnest in his search for unity. He must think back and back, behind things, behind even what his fellows called God, to find the root of the universe. And if affirming Tao as his ultimate principle Lao-tsze dethrones

Ti, I demur to his being on that account accused of atheism or suspected of irreligion. No doubt with an indefinable and unknowable ultimate you can have only a very attenuated religious life. What Lao-tsze has to say of man's conscious and deliberate relation to Tao we shall see soon. Here let us recognize that it is not loss, or that it is at least final gain, to have sublated and taken out of the way a limited God, a mere disposer of events, a deistic God supreme but not ultimate, and so not absolutely supreme, who as a particular Being makes up along with subordinate spirits and the world of visible things the universe as we know it—to have a God of this kind taken out of the way in favour of some form of Monism. For Taoism is in intention monistic. Of Tao are all things, and Tao is in and works through all. No doubt Lao-tsze admits, as we shall see, in men and, I think, even in nature, the occurrence of acts and processes which are not in accordance with Tao, and which therefore imply in their subjects some distinction from Tao. This is not consistent in a strict Monism; but can any Monism be consistent? At any rate in Tao, the origin of all things and the immanent principle in all, we have a possible basis for a doctrine of God not only more philosophical but also more truly religious than the Deism—perhaps we should rather coin a word and say the Spiritism—which in Lao-tsze's mind it displaced.

I have said that we may find in Lao-tsze's doctrine of Tao a basis for a doctrine of God. Let it be frankly recognized that there is no use searching the *Tao Teh King* for any encouragement to attribute to Tao any of the attributes of consciousness. Is it at all possible, then, to raise Tao in moral and religious value? in short, to metamorphose Tao into God? I have spoken of Christian affinities. I would suggest here as a more fitting term for what I mean 'susceptibilities.' We have already noted in Lao-tsze something like intellectual dissatisfaction with his conclusion in Tao when he says, 'I do not know whose son it is.' Now, if I were speaking with a disciple of Lao-tsze, I think that I would fasten on this point of the inadequacy of Tao as ultimate principle, an inadequacy which Lao-tsze seems himself to feel. Tao does not explain itself. It is still inevitable that we put the question, 'Whence is it?' 'Whose son is it?' And not explaining itself it fails also to explain other things. If it is an answer to their 'whence,' it is no answer to their 'why.' I should then make use of the other meanings of the word Tao, which means 'way' certainly, but which also means 'reason' and 'speech.' And I would ask the Taoist why he drops these higher meanings and their spiritual implications. I would try to induce him to discard the negations of his Tao, and to approximate to that Christian Taoism which we have in our Chinese Version of St. John's Gospel, 'In the beginning was Tao, and Tao was with God, and Tao was God. All things were made by Tao, and without Tao was not anything made that hath been made'—a Taoism which gives us a richer conception of Tao and of Ti, and a truer and more satisfying relation between them.

This illustrates what I mean by the Christian susceptibilities of Taoism, the occurrence of words and phrases which are not originally of any Christian sense—as unqualified, unknowable, Tao is not Christian—but which are in some measure patient of a Christian interpretation, or may be deflected to Christian uses. In spite of an appearance of sophistry and a real danger, perhaps, of sophistical abuse, this is, I think, a legitimate apologetic method; and, if I am not mistaken, we can discover instances of its use in the early Christian apologists in their dealings both with Jews and with pagans. Perhaps even St. John's use of the term Logos is a case in point of the Christian appropriation, with apologetic intent, of a current philosophical term, and its deflection to a greater or less extent from its current philosophical meaning. I know that this apologetic procedure seems to some persons not only sophistical but also dangerous to the purity of Christian thought; and such persons would point to St. John's adaptation of the term Logos as the beginning of what they call the disastrous Hellenizing of Christianity. I confess that I am not so convinced of the disastrous character of that process, and that I think reasons can be found for a more favourable judgment of it, still short of accepting as sacrosanct the theological determinations of the early Councils, if we are more thoroughgoing in our doctrine of Providence and in our belief in the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. And I venture to suggest whether as Christianity in its extension through the world and its persistence through the ages is brought into contact with various phases of thought, its adoption and adaptation of the terms in which great thinkers have expressed their imperfect solutions of the riddle of existence, is not part of that enrichment of the city of God of which

we read in the words, 'They shall bring the honour and the glory of the nations into it.'

I apologize for this digression and make haste to return to Lao-tsze. I have begun with what is most abstruse, his metaphysic, because, as his first chapter has hinted to us, it is one of his glories as a thinker that his metaphysic determines all his thinking. If one were to seek to contrast him with the other great master of Chinese thought, Confucius, it might be said with as much truth as epigrams usually have, that while Confucius is a moralist, Lao-tsze is a philosopher. Only if we put it in this way we must beware of thinking that the moral interest is any less strong in Lao-tsze than it is in Confucius. The *Tao Teh King* is singularly devoid of biographical detail; but Lao-tsze gives us a hint or two even there of the impulse that urged him to think. I shall not yield to the temptation of trying to construct 'a conjectural history' of Lao-tsze's thought. Still we may remind ourselves of the circumstances of his age. It was the time of the decay of the Chou supremacy, a time of decadence and of political and social disorder. From the more historical notices which we have of the state of things in the time of Confucius, we can tell pretty well what it must have been in the time of Lao-tsze, some fifty years earlier. As in all such times of social disintegration men were driven back on themselves. There were those who withdrew from the turmoil; and so we have the recluses of whom we have glimpses in the Confucian Analects, and more imaginary descriptions in the writings of Chwang-tsze. In them we see one effect of that social disorder and unsettlement which, acting on a different mind, compelled Lao-tsze to seek a remedy for its ills and so made him a philosopher—a philosopher who, if the accounts we have of him are to be trusted, finally acknowledged defeat by mysteriously withdrawing from the ken of that and every future age through the Western Pass.

For this state of moral and political decay both Lao-tsze and Confucius propounded their remedies. Confucius represents the conservative reaction. The method of Confucius, which he practised so far as he could individually and officially, and which he urged the rulers of his time to adopt, was to revive and reinforce the institutions and ceremonies of what he looked back to as the Golden Age of Chinese History. It is related that Confucius once went to visit Lao-tsze to question him on the subject of ceremonies. Lao-tsze replied to him, 'The men about whom you talk are dead, and their bones are mouldered to dust; only their words are left. Put away your proud air and many desires, your insinuating habit and wild will. They are of no advantage to you. This is all I have to tell you.' Whatever we may think of the historicity of the anecdote, it accurately enough reflects Lao-tsze's standpoint. He will have nothing to do with the artificial resurrection of a past age by the reimposition of traditional rules and ceremonies. Neither the dead hand of the past, no, nor any external rule whatever, must be imposed on the spontaneous life of the present.

Yet it might almost be thought that dependence on the past was an invariable feature of Chinese thought. For Lao-tsze, too, has his Golden Age to which he looks back, in an antiquity more distant even than that which Confucius was fain to recall. His Golden Age is the age of instinctive morality, the gradual loss of which he more than once deplores. 'In the highest antiquity the people did not know that there were their rulers. In the next age they loved them and praised them. In the next they feared them. In the next they despised them. Thus it was that when faith in the Tao was deficient in the rulers, a want of faith in them ensued in the people' (17). 'When the great Tao ceased to be observed, benevolence and righteousness came into vogue. Then appeared wisdom and shrewdness, and there ensued great hypocrisy. When harmony no longer prevailed throughout the six kinships, filial sons found their manifestation; when the states and clans fell into disorder, loyal ministers appeared' (chap. 18). 'Thus it was that when Tao was lost, *its attributes* (Teh) appeared; when *its attributes* (Teh) were lost, benevolence appeared; when benevolence was lost, righteousness appeared; and when righteousness was lost, the proprieties appeared.' So then the Golden Age to which Lao-tsze looks back is that highest antiquity before Tao was lost, the age of instinctive morality when goodness did not know itself as goodness, and so the separate virtues were not distinguished. You will have noticed Lao-tsze's suggestion that the emergence of some evil is needed to call forth its opposite good. Lao-tsze, however, would not say *felix culpa*, but rather *virtus infelix*. The whole development is for him degeneration. So far does he carry this thought, that he would have us cut off our sageness, benevolence, and wisdom to attain

our true life. If we take his words strictly, it might even seem that to him the remotest antiquity is the time of Tao without *its attributes* (Teh)—for it was only when Tao was lost that its attributes appeared—the time of spontaneity without spontaneous action, which is, I should suppose, about as near as one can get to the idea of pure potentiality, a primitive Nirvana from which we have fallen. At any rate, in this calling forth of good by its corresponding evil, Lao-tsze had before him a concrete case of the law of association of contradictories, and this law of thought no doubt had its own influence in Lao-tsze's thinking, suggesting undeveloped unity as origin and in a sense as goal, or justifying the adoption of such a suggestion. He had the law clearly before him, for in his second chapter we read, 'Existence and non-existence give birth the one to the idea of the other; difficulty and ease produce the one the idea of the other: so with length and shortness, height and lowness, the musical notes and tones, the being before and behind. Therefore,' continues Lao-tsze in his abrupt way, 'therefore the Sage manages affairs without doing anything, and conveys his instructions without the use of speech.' The link of connexion is this. Anything positive is accompanied by its inevitable shadow. It is better, therefore, to abide in the indefinite, *i.e.* the instinctive life, and not advance to the definiteness of a life of deliberation and regulation. That this is the connexion is made more evident by Lao-tsze's next paragraph, which holds up for our imitation the quiet processes of nature.

(*To be continued.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

Revelation xx. 12.

'And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works.'—R.V.

Introduction.

This verse belongs to the sixth of the visions described in these chapters. It is the vision of the Last Judgment. And although it occupies only five verses (20^{11-15}), it contains all that the Apocalyptic writer has to say about that great assize which is to follow the resurrection. There is no more impressive picture even in this book where such pictures abound. It says so little, and yet all is said. The throne, dazzling with the whiteness of the Divine purity; the Judge, reverently indicated, but not named; the whole material fabric of the universe gone, fled, so that there are not even rocks which men may call upon to fall on them; 'the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne,' and, besides, nothing but the books in which their works are written, and that other book, the Book of Life.[1]

[1] C. A. Scott, *The Book of the Revelation*, p. 298.

The subject is the Judgment of the Dead. It may be treated in four parts: (1) the subjects of the judgment; (2) the ground of the judgment; (3) the evidence; (4) the acquittal.

I.

The Subjects of the Judgment.

'I saw the dead,' says the Seer, 'the great and the small, standing before the throne.' It is often said that this judgment is a judgment of the wicked only, and therefore only for condemnation. But the context suggests that the judgment is extended to all humanity; and only in that sense can the wording of the passage itself be taken. The phrase 'the great and the small,' which is of frequent occurrence in the Apocalypse, is a synonym for all men (except where it is expressly limited, 11^{18}).[2] 'The dead, small and great, will stand before God; *all* will stand, all the righteous, as well as all the wicked, from the Apostles downwards. St. Paul is very express upon the fact that he himself will be judged, "He that judgeth me is the Lord" (1 Co 4^{4}). "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who

[2] *Ibid.* p. 299.

by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life" (Rom $2^{6.7}$). "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body" (2 Co 5^{10}). Again, Rom 14^{10}, "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." "The Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom" (2 Ti 4^{1})."[1]

Why are only the dead mentioned? Why not the living? Swete thinks it is because they form so insignificant a minority; but he suggests also that the omission may be due to the fact that the keen interest which the first generation had felt in the bearing of the Parousia upon the living (1 Th $4^{13.14}$) had abated before the end of the century.

The dead are all there, whatever their condition on earth may have been, 'from the Pro-consul, as that official was often reminded by Christians who appeared before him, down to the meanest slave.'

'In that great judgment-day the difference of sizes among human lives, of which we make so much, passes away, and all human beings, in simple virtue of their human quality, are called to face the everlasting righteousness. The child and the greybeard, the scholar and the boor, however their lives may have been separated here, they come together there. It is upon the moral ground that the most separated souls must always meet. All may be good: all may be bad; therefore before Him whose nature is the decisive touchstone of goodness and badness in every nature which is laid before it all, souls of all the generations of mankind may be assembled. The only place where all can meet, and every soul claim its relationship with every other soul, is before the throne of God. The Father's presence alone furnishes the meeting-place for all the children, regardless of differences of age or wisdom.'[2]

'What is meant by standing before God? We are apt to picture to ourselves a great dramatic scene, host beyond host, rank behind rank, the millions who have lived upon the earth, all standing crowded together in the indescribable presence of One who looks not merely at the mass, but at the individual, and sees through the whole life and character of every single soul. The picture is sublime, and it is what the words of St. John are intended to suggest. But we must get behind the picture to its meaning. The picture must describe not one scene only, but the whole nature and condition of the everlasting life. The souls of men in the eternal world are always "standing before God." And what does that mean? We understand at once if we consider that that before which a man stands is the standard, or test, or source of judgment for his life. Every soul that counts itself capable of judgment and responsibility stands in some presence by which the nature of its judgment is decreed. The higher the presence, the loftier and greater, though often the more oppressed and anxious, is the life. A weak man, who wants to shirk the seriousness and anxiety of life, goes down into some lower chamber and stands before some baser judge, whose standard will be less exacting. A strong, ambitious man presses up from judgment-room to judgment-room, and is not satisfied with meeting any standard perfectly so long as there is any higher standard which he has not faced.'[3]

[1] M. F. Sadler, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, p. 259.

[2] Phillips Brooks, *Twenty Sermons*, p. 60.

II.

The Ground of the Judgment.

'The dead were judged . . . according to their works.' So it is a judgment according to works, according to the things *done* in the body, which no doubt includes the things spoken and thought. And a judgment according to works is clearly taught in all the Scriptures—in the Gospels (Mt 16^{27} and parallels), by Paul (Ro $14^{10.12}$, 1 Co 4^{5}, 2 Co 5^{10}, Gal 6^{7}), and John (5^{29}, Rev $20^{12.13}$). But there is also another doctrine taught—that salvation is granted to faith, and to faith only. How are these two doctrines to be reconciled?

The fundamental grace, says Godet, is that of the forgiveness of sins, and it presupposes no other moral condition than faith only. But this immense act of grace is no sooner granted by God, and accepted by man, than there results from it a new task, with the responsibility which attaches to it. This is the work of sanctification; the renewal of the life in the likeness of Christ. And this is the *work*, according to which the believer will one day be judged. Godet recalls by way of illustration the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant.[4]

And this is in accordance with reason and experience. In this world men are judged according to their works. I believe it to be true, says Dr. Salmon, that Nature never forgives: the utmost indulgence she bestows is often to postpone the execution of her penalty. In this life the rewards for what is well done are duly paid, the punishment for what is done ill strictly exacted. And what the Bible says is that the same principle is followed in the future life.[5]

At the same time, judgments in this life are not always unerring, or always passed on good grounds; and St. John is probably making a

[3] *Ibid.* p. 60.

[4] F. Godet, *Studies on the New Testament*, p. 179.

[5] G. Salmon, in *Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd ser. i. 140.

contrast as well as a comparison. He knows that Cæsar has a throne, and that men are made great or small by standing before that throne, but he objects to the ground upon which judgment is given. Men are given their places without reference to character; they are not judged according to their works. Their position is often determined by arbitrary circumstances—family, name, wealth, influence. He sees men stand before a new throne, before a tribunal guided by other principles. Many of the first become last, and many of the last become first. 'Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, were at the top of the list in the old society; in the new they are very near the end of it—only saved from being quite at the end by the imputation of insanity. And, in the place of honour which was held by Tiberius and Caligula and Nero, stands many a despised slave, many a deformed outcast—outcast by reason of his deformity, many a poor invalid considered unfit for survival, and whom the old world's chariot had passed, contemptuous, by.'[1]

'A friend of mine who had travelled in America told me that he once heard Colonel Ingersoll lecture on the Last Judgment. That blasphemous atheist described with all the brilliant sarcasm which he possesses the last dread scene, and pictured different characters coming up to receive their sentence. First there came one who had ever helped his neighbour, who in life had done all that he could to make the world brighter and happier; and Jesus, the Supreme Judge, asked him if he believed the story of Eve and the rib; and on replying in the negative, sentenced him to eternal damnation; and so on with a number of characters. Then there came a defalcating bank director, who had broken the heart of the widow and ruined the orphan by his dishonesty and hypocrisy; but he believed this story, and so was rewarded with eternal happiness. Ingersoll's caricature is more than a caricature; it is a wilful lie.'[2]

III.

The Evidence.

'And books were opened.' The imagery is evidently suggested by Daniel's vision of judgment (7^{10}): 'Thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened.' The idea of a special book of life is to be found in the same prophet (12^{1}): 'At the same time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book'; but this figure can be traced much further back. You will remember the passionate intercession of Moses for his people (Ex 32^{32}): 'If thou wilt not forgive their sin, blot me, I pray thee, out of the book that thou hast written.' And not to speak of some passages in the prophets, which speak of 'those that are written among the living' (Is 4^{3}, Ezk 13^{9}), one of the imprecations in the 69th Psalm (v.[28]) is, 'Let them be blotted out of the book of life, and not be written with the righteous.' These Old Testament passages illustrate the meaning of our Lord's promise (Rev 3^{5}) to him that overcometh: 'I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels.' St. John is not the only New Testament writer who has adopted this language. St. Luke (10^{20}) records our Lord's words to the seventy disciples when they returned successful from their mission, 'In this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven.' The Epistle to the Hebrews (12^{23}) speaks of 'the general assembly and church of the firstborn which are written in heaven'; and in the Epistle to the Philippians (4^{3}) St. Paul has the very phrase, 'Clement also, with other of my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life.'[3]

Before considering what books are opened, notice that they *are* opened, that it is an open judgment. 'This,' says Mozley, 'is the great characteristic of future judgment. It does not leave the subject of punishment uncertain, so that a man does not know what he is punished for. All is open and plain dealing. We are told the reason of everything. We naturally connect a future judgment with a revelation of sin. The court is an open court; the proceedings are proclaimed, the charges are published, and the dead are judged out of the things that are written in the books. It would seem to be a kind of *Magna Charta* of the next world, that nothing shall be done without making known the grounds on which it is done. It is a transparent world; justice is a public justice, and proclaims its sentence upon the house-tops. The whole congregation of God's creatures is made a witness to it—confirms and ratifies the great work of divine reward and punishment, and stamps the impress of conscience upon it.'[4]

[1] G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, p. 238.
[2] H. S. Lunn, in *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxvii. 279.
[3] G. Salmon, in *The Contemporary Pulpit*, p. 129.
[4] J. B. Mozley, *Sermons Parochial and Occasional*, p. 337.

The books that are opened may be taken as the records of man's works wherever they may be found, although Augustine is probably right when he says that there is supposed to be a separate record for every man.

1. **The Book of Nature.**—Paul says: 'The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood (or interpreted) by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they (the heathen) are without excuse.' Yet Paganism had its birth and grew up under the glowing presence of God, to the wretched moral extremity portrayed by history, and of which things it is a shame to speak. Pantheism, which makes God and nature one, robbing him of personality after infecting him with sin; Deism, which smites away providence and makes the world a God-forsaken machine; Atheism, the conclusion of 'the fool'; Agnosticism, the label of the man who claims to know nothing about any God,—must all be judged for their godless reputation by this book of nature, which protests by day and by night against their degrading doctrines.[1]

'You know that trees, by virtue of certain marks inscribed upon the inner surface of them, reveal the number of years they have been growing. Here, say, is a majestic oak; it has stood the breezes of a thousand years; at last the lightning flash, the sweep of the hurricane, or the stroke of the woodman's axe fells it and snaps it in twain. What does the eye catch sight of? A series of circles marked upon the inner surface of the trunk, each circle lying outside the other, of different degrees of thickness, and different shades of colour. And what a story have we there! The number of those circles marked upon the trunk tells the number of years that oak has been growing. Here is one circle thinner than its neighbour, of less decided colour—it teaches us that that year, in the history of the oak, was a year of drought, when the windows of heaven refused to open and the floods declined to come, and the life was checked and stunted. Side by side with it is another, thicker than its fellows, of more decided colour. That tells us that that year in the history of the tree was a year of the fulness of moisture, when the windows of heaven were opened, and the floods came, and the life of the tree waxed strong and lusty. All these years the oak has stood with all these secrets in its heart. At last the time of discovery comes. Then the instructed eye can see that all the time the oak has been writing out upon itself for us to read the history of years.[2]

2. **The Book of Revelation.**—This is not the Apocalypse simply, but the whole Bible. For the whole Bible is an apocalypse or revelation. Our Lord said, 'He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.' That word is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. In the Old Testament we find the Law. Its sum is 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.' In the New Testament we find the gospel. Its sum is 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.'[3]

3. **The Book of Memory.**—A perfect memory will accompany judgment. This will not seem incredible to those who reflect upon the phenomena of the decays and revivals of memory in this life. Read the chapter in Locke (*On the Understanding*) to which he gives the name of 'Retention.' A section in that chapter is headed 'Ideas fade in the Memory.' They leave no more footsteps, says the philosopher, than shadows flying over fields of corn. They are like children of our youth who die before us—'like the tombs to which we are approaching, where, though the brass and marble remain, yet the inscriptions are effaced by time, and the imagery fades away'—like pictures laid on in fading colours. Yet there are revivals of memory, to which Locke does not refer, which are more wonderful by far. The fields of memory at some magic touch give back again all the lights and shadows which have ever swept across their surface. The children of memory rise again from their graves, and wander in without warning into the once familiar rooms which they have long ceased to visit. The canvas of memory is retouched by some artist whose skill restores the tints which had faded away. The colours of memory are like those in Egyptian halls, long concealed by sand, but fresh as if they had just come from the painter's hand when the drifted heaps are blown away.[4]

'Some accident often brings up to our remembrance events or conversations of times long gone by, which had been absent from our minds for years. A statement made by the late Admiral Beaufort has been often quoted. He was rescued from drowning and reanimated after he had for some time lost consciousness. He stated that in the last few moments of consciousness a host of long-buried memories had suddenly started into life, and that he seemed in these few moments to peruse the history of his whole past life. I think it is too much to assume, as has sometimes been done, that this is the ordinary experience of drowning persons, but we cannot

[1] A. W. Ringland, in *The Homiletic Review*, xvii. 37.

[2] S. D. F. Salmond, in *The Christian World Pulpit*, xxxiv. 265.

[3] C. Jerdan, *Pastures of Tender Grass*, p. 424.

[4] W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, p. 96.

doubt that the book of our memories contains stored up materials for the account we have to render, and that when God brings each of us into judgment, He can make our own recollections bear witness to the truth of the secrets disclosed, and force us to own that it is we ourselves, and no others, whose history is laid open.'[1]

4. The Book of Conscience.—But the book of memory is by itself not a source of judgment. There is a very common misconception on this point. It is quite safe to affirm that any man who has been able to do a bad deed without a twinge will, other things being equal, be able to *remember* it without a twinge. Surely perception is at least as vivid as memory; if the actual sight of evil has failed to move, the mere remembrance of evil will move still less. Why is it, then, that in the dawning of moral conviction men shrink from memory—that even a Newman cries, 'Remember not past years'? It is because another book has been opened—the book of conscience. If the book of memory were opened alone, it would be morally powerless, valueless; its power lies in the volume below. What, then, is the influence which, according to St. John, is to open this underlying volume—this book of conscience? He tells us what it is in the preceding verse quite explicitly: 'I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.' That which opens the book of conscience is the vision of the great white throne—the sight of an ideal of superhuman purity. Man will know his sin by Christ, not Christ by his sin; nothing but the blaze of the throne can teach him his own night.[2]

Isaiah had a vision which revealed to him in the same moment the holiness of God and his own sinfulness.

'Let me give you one instance of the revival of what may be called the memory of conscience.

'Some sin committed years ago, long veiled over, perhaps deeply repented, perhaps really forgotten, turns up, by some extraordinary combination, in the infinite variety of human concerns, in a court of law. You are placed in the witness-box for torture worse than that of a wretch broken upon the wheel. An insolent master of the science of sarcasm plunges his steel into your soul, and turns it round in the wound until you writhe in agony. Then comes a question calling for exact recollection on your part of certain apparently minute circumstances, which intensify your shame. You say, and perhaps with truth, 'I cannot remember.' Then the master of the torture turns upon you, and fiercely says, 'You do not remember! I will make you remember.' He is as good as his word. The night which you thought had faded away into the oblivion of eternity; the letter which you had tossed into the fire, that great keeper of secrets;—you shall recall the exact point at which you noted the hand upon the clock, you shall respell every line scrawled with a trembling hand upon the paper. The book shall be opened for you.'[3]

5. The Book of Character.—This last book, which is the most difficult to read here, will be as plain to read as the others there. It is a book in two parts. One part is the record of all that has gone to make up our own character. The other is the record of all the influence we have had on the character of others.

It may be said that impressions are so numerous and conflicting that they can yield no distinct picture hereafter. But we must not limit the capacity of the soul in this respect, in the presence of greater mysteries. In some sense, it may present, as it were, a continually fresh surface. A most apt illustration waits upon our thought drawn from the palimpsests found in the monasteries of Italy; parchments that, centuries ago, were inscribed with the history or laws of heathen Rome, the edicts of persecuting emperors, or the annals of conquest. When the Church arose, the same parchments were used again to record the legends and prayers of the saints. Later still, they were put to further use in rehearsing the speculations of the schoolmen, or the revival of letters, yet presenting but one written surface. But modern science has learned to uncover these overlaid writings one after another, finding upon one surface the speculations of learning, the prayers of the Church, and the blasphemies of paganism. And so it may be with the tablets of the soul, written over and over again, but no writing ever effaced, they wait for the master-hand that shall uncover them to be read of all. What are these Apocalyptic books but records of our works printed upon our hearts? What are the books opened but man opened to himself?[4]

Science has been showing us of late something of the force residing in the actinic rays of light, by which it transfers impressions from one object to another. Wherever light goes, it carries and leaves images. The trees mirror one another, and opposing mountains wear each the likeness of the other upon their rocky breasts. These fine properties in nature suggest corresponding probabilities in man. It is poor logic to accept these fresh miracles of nature that are being so often

[1] G. Salmon, in *Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd ser., i. 133.
[2] G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, p. 242.
[3] W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, p. 97.
[4] T. T. Munger, *The Freedom of Faith*, p. 353.

revealed, and hold that we have compassed man and his possibilities. If such a process as this is going on in the dull substances without, how much more surely is it going on in the soul. All contact leaves its mark.[1]

LOST DAYS.

The lost days of my life until to-day,
What were they, could I see them on the street
Lie as they fell? Would they be ears of wheat
Sown once for food but trodden into clay?
Or golden coins squandered and still to pay?
Or drops of blood dabbling the guilty feet?
Or such spilt water as in dreams must cheat
The undying throats of Hell, athirst alway?
I do not see them here; but after death
God knows I know the faces I shall see,
Each one a murdered self, with low last breath,
'I am thyself,—what hast thou done to me?'
'And I—and I—thyself,' (lo! each one saith,)
'And thou thyself to all eternity!'

DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI
(*House of Life*, Sonnet 86).

IV.

THE BOOK OF LIFE.

THE best account of the ideas associated with the Book of Life will be found in an article under that title in the second volume of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. In that article Dr. Alfred Jeremias of Leipzig shows that the idea of heavenly books is present in the religion of Babylonia, Egypt, Persia, India, China, and Islam. In the mythology of Babylon, reference is often made to the 'tables of destiny,' which probably refer to two heavenly tablets, on one of which were written the commands of the gods, on the other the records of the life of men. The idea of a reckoning kept in heaven of men's deeds frequently occurs in the Apocryphal literature. The suggestion of such a reckoning may have come from the roll or register of citizens, such as the register of the citizens of Jerusalem referred to in Is 4^{3}. Such a roll God Himself keeps of the names of His own people. Moses refers to it when he says, 'And if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written' (Ex 32^{32}). In Ps 79^{28} it is called the 'book of life.' In Rev 13^{8} it becomes the Lamb's book of life.

It is as the Lamb's book of life that it is referred to in our text. The book contains the names of those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. After all the books on which the works of men have been recorded are opened, the Book of Life is opened. Upon the record of the other books, what can a man hope for but condemnation? But those whose names are found in the Book of Life have been purchased unto God through the precious blood of the Lamb. There is therefore now no condemnation to them.

It is true Moses spoke of the possibility of being blotted out of the book of life; and St. Paul himself insists that faith must work by love—'Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity' (2 Ti 2^{19}).

JUDGMENT.

Almightie Judge, how shall poor wretches brook
Thy dreadfull look,
Able a heart of iron to appall,
When Thou shalt call
For ev'ry man's peculiar book?

What others mean to do I know not well;
Yet I heare tell
That some will turn Thee to some leaves therein
So void of sinne,
That they in merit shall excell.

But I resolve, when Thou shalt call for mine,
That to decline,
And thrust a Testament into Thy hand:
Let that be scann'd,
There Thou shalt finde my faults are Thine.

GEORGE HERBERT, *The Temple*.

[1] T. T. Munger, *The Freedom of Faith*, p. 353.

Professor Stanton on the Synoptic Problem.

By the Rev. Arthur Wright, D.D., Vice-President of Queens' College, Cambridge.

Dr. Stanton's book, entitled *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II., has been eagerly expected. Dr. Stanton has lectured on the Synoptic Problem for many years. He knows its history and the numerous solutions which have been offered. And, whereas some men fail because, although they have read Loisy, Harnack, Wellhausen, Weizsäcker, or Holtzmann, they have but a superficial acquaintance with the minutiæ of the Gospels, Dr. Stanton knows all the similarities and divergences. And it is as true in historical criticism, as it is in textual criticism, that knowledge of documents is essential to sound work.

I am glad to find myself in complete agreement with Dr. Stanton on many fundamental questions. It is because the differences between us are slight, and may by a little explanation be reduced, that this paper is written. In particular, I am pleased with his masterly vindication of the doctrine of a proto-Mark. (For the sake of the uninitiated I may explain that a proto-Mark is a shorter recension of St. Mark, drawn up at an earlier date, and used by St. Luke. There are excellent reasons for thinking that St. Luke was not acquainted with our second Gospel in its present form.) Dr. Sanday assails Dr. Stanton on this very question. He attributes St. Luke's omissions to lack of space. The roll of paper which he used was not large enough to hold more; as though it were impossible to have some extra sheets added to it, or (as Juvenal says) to write on both sides of the paper. It is on examining details that I find it so difficult to accept Dr. Sanday's explanation. Why, for example, should St. Luke, being himself a Gentile and writing for Gentiles, omit our Lord's journey through the Gentile cities of Decapolis? Why should he omit the words 'to all the Gentiles' from the quotation, 'My house shall be called the house of prayer'? Why omit 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to all the Gentiles'? Dr. Stanton would reply that St. Luke omitted these and other perplexing passages because he was not acquainted with them. On any other hypothesis the omissions seem to me to be inexplicable.

It was to vindicate the doctrine of a proto-Mark that I have so long insisted on the truth of the oral hypothesis. Dr. Stanton, however, thinks that the proto-Mark may have been a document. He insists that the oral hypothesis is inadequate, and he devotes several pages to a refutation of my teaching about it. I am always glad to discuss that question. Most modern critics of the Gospels decline to discuss it at all. But I shall perhaps astonish the reader when I say that Dr. Stanton's rejection of the oral hypothesis and my acceptance of it amount, practically, to the same thing. I am in substantial agreement with him, as I now proceed to show.

Dr. Stanton objects to the oral hypothesis chiefly on two grounds: (1) He thinks that there is such an amount of minute editing in St. Luke's Gospel and in St. Matthew's, that a written Mark must have lain before those Evangelists, or they could not have made the multitudinous changes which they have made. (2) He denies that Europeans would take the trouble so carefully to master the oral records, as to be able to pass on the tradition unimpaired for many years. Oral teaching, if it consisted (as I assert) in learning by heart, may reasonably be predicated of the Eastern Church, but not of the Western. Granted that St. Luke, being probably a Syrian, had no objection to learn long passages himself, it is quite another thing to believe that he imposed so laborious a process upon St. Paul's converts. They would certainly have objected to bear the yoke of slavery.

It rests with me, therefore, (1) to explain how the minute editing may have been done, and (2) to prove that learning by heart was not foreign to European habits.

In the first page of my first book on the Gospels, I showed how oral teaching may have originated. St. Peter (I suggested) wrote down a lesson upon a tablet, and read it to his pupils, who copied it upon their tablets and repeated it aloud until they had mastered it. Next day they would rehearse the old lesson from memory, with the occasional help of prompting, and then learn another. Day by day they would repeat the process, until a considerable cycle of teaching was formed. St. Peter might have half a dozen tablets for refreshing his

memory, until the words were indelibly impressed on his mind, but a schoolboy is content with one slate, or (in those days) with one tablet. The more diligent and capable boys, on becoming men, could be used as Catechists to teach others. Such teachers were necessary when Churches were multiplied, and we often meet with allusions to them and their work in the Acts and in the Epistles.

So then documents—temporary documents—were in use from the first. I do not abate my claim to adhere to the oral hypothesis by conceding that. Not only so, but at every improvement of the record writing materials were used; sometimes a tablet and stylus, sometimes paper and ink.

The first of these improvements (according to Papias) was the translation of St. Peter's Aramaic into Greek. St. Mark, having been appointed St. Peter's translator, would first write down upon a tablet a section of the Aramaic, and then upon another tablet he would compose a Greek version of it. He would take time and make erasures until he was satisfied with the rendering. Then he would teach it to a class of 'Grecians,' just as St. Peter had taught it to a class of 'Hebrews.'

A Gospel was like a river. It began with a few small rills and rushed rapidly downhill, accumulating strength as it went. The further it advanced, the less was the rush. Something was lost by evaporation and percolation, much was gained by affluents. Sources multiplied. For some time they were kept separate. Then some one undertook the serious task of welding them into one Gospel. Four or five threads had to be twisted into one rope. There is reason to think that the first-beginnings of this work were made in the Metropolitan Church of Jerusalem, but that St. Luke first completed the task, forming the complex Gospel which was thenceforth used in the West.

St. Luke would take the proto-Mark, the proto-Matthew, the Pauline collection, and some scraps of the deutero-Mark, together with such anonymous fragments as had reached him at Philippi. Many of these he had probably collected in a commonplace book, kept in his private custody. His first task would be to procure a written copy of such of the sections as were not already in writing. He used Mark as the framework of his Gospel, and incorporated with it the other sources by means of the art of conflation, in the following manner:—

After carefully analyzing the non-Marcan matter, he found in it about twenty-four different subjects. He would put down the twenty-four headings upon a tablet and number them. Then he would work through his MSS, placing in the margin the letter *alpha* wherever the subject-matter showed that the passage belonged to his first heading, *beta* where it belonged to his second, and so on through all the non-Marcan sources, until everything had been classified and numbered, exactly as the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons are written in the margin of MSS of the Greek Testament.

His next process would be to copy all the *alpha* passages upon one sheet of paper, all the *beta* passages upon another, and so with every letter. Finally, he would arrange the several utterances in what seemed to him the best order. They seldom contained in themselves any note of time or place, and an editor, therefore, must make ventures in dealing with them; but, when he had satisfied himself, he would supply such prefaces, connecting links, and conclusions as would weld the conflation together, and make it fit into its destined place in the Gospel.

It was nothing short of a revolution to substitute the new complex history for the old simple chronicle. A new set of catechists would have to be supplied, or the old ones learn a new lesson. The intricacy of the work shows that it was done, not gradually, but at one stroke. The authority of St. Paul may well have been exerted to introduce it in the Churches.

Meanwhile St. Luke kept his documents and polished them before publishing them. Horace advises an author to take nine years for this task. But the Churches could not wait so long. It would also prepare the way for the coming Gospel, if the complex record were put into oral use. Sir John Hawkins has shown that every Evangelist took immense pains in finishing off the work. Each Gospel has its own peculiar style, vocabulary, and embellishments. Even the trito-Mark within his narrower range was as sedulous in editing as were the others. His 'picturesque' additions I regard as editorial ornaments, and Dr. Stanton agrees that many of them are so.

As long as a man maintains (as Dr. Stanton does) that a document is simply the oral teaching committed to writing, I reckon him as a believer in the oral hypothesis. Publication is quite another matter. 'Litera scripta manet.' If the proto-Mark had been published, I do not see how

it could have perished and left no trace behind, for it was not like those inchoate attempts to which St. Luke alludes in his preface, most of which perished because they did not deserve to live.

It is obvious that if St. Matthew entered upon the work of conflation a few years later than St. Luke had done, he would find both sources expanded. He used, that is to say, a deutero-Mark and a deutero-Matthew. Very slight changes had been made in the old sections, but a considerable number of new sections had been added. St. Matthew collected the non-Marcan sections into five long conflations instead of twenty-four short ones. He inserted them into the Marcan framework quite differently from St. Luke. And he dovetailed a good many non-Marcan utterances into Marcan sections. We explain this independent action by inferring that he was not acquainted with St. Luke's work.

And now let us consider the objection that Western Christians would not be at the trouble to memorize the records. I have never taught that grown-up persons, either in the East or in the West, were successful in learning many chapters by heart. A man, who has passed his fortieth year, finds the task of memorizing peculiarly irksome. He is slow at mastering a lesson, quick at forgetting it. The catechumens, both in the Jewish Synagogue and in the Christian Church, were for the most part boys. Theophilus was a boy when he was catechized, but in mature life his boyish lessons were partially obscured, till he was glad to have in writing what he once knew by heart. St. Mark is called a 'Chazzan' in Ac 13^5, and it was the chief duty of a Chazzan to teach the boys during the week, and to assist at the Sunday services for grown-up people. If the Chazzan recited the Gospel on Sunday to the congregation, such of them as had learned it in their boyhood would have their memory refreshed.

The case may be illustrated by what happened in Churches until quite recently. Every child was required to learn the Church Catechism (or the Shorter Catechism), the collect for the day, and sometimes the Epistle and Gospel. When the children became men or women, the public reading of Scripture in Church sufficed for their religious needs, only the teacher knew the Catechism thoroughly, and could correct the minutest mistake.

Now, if we Westerns, down to the middle of the nineteenth century, were so sedulous in learning by heart, is it not a mistake to think that in the first century the effort would be declined? We have abundance of evidence that learning by heart was practised even by adults. It was in the West that Rhapsodists recited whole books of Homer, as I heard the *Arabian Nights* recited in Tangiers. In the West, Virgil's *Æneid* was learned by rote. At Rome every educated boy could repeat the list of consuls, two for each year, for seven hundred and seventy-six years and upwards, even as I, when a boy, recited the Kings of England, with the dates of their accession and the length of their reigns. Orators learned their speeches by heart, and declaimed them by help of a *memoria technica*. Rhetoricians composed 'commonplaces,' which consisted of elegant extracts to be learned by heart, and used as occasion offered. Juvenal tells how *crambe repetita* was the death of the unfortunate schoolmaster. What was this but the task of hearing repetitions? When I was at school, the master listened while thirty-three boys repeated (or failed to repeat) forty lines of prose or poetry, in Greek, Latin, or English, four times a week. For learning by heart was then regarded an essential part of education. The present Bishop of Durham, when I read with him at Cambridge, advised me to continue it, but I thought myself too old.

The boys forgot: the teacher remembered. The Catechists knew, what Theophilus half knew. It was by Catechists that the tradition was preserved. If Professor Stanton doubts this, Professor Gwatkin asserts it. In his recently published *Early Church History* (vol. i. p. 279) he writes: 'The Gospel . . . was diligently taught in the Eastern way by the first generation of Evangelists. The master gives out a story—in our time a sura of the Koran—and repeats it till the scholars have thoroughly learned it before going on to another. Hence the tradition of the Apostolic age was not the loose report it is so commonly taken for, but a pretty definite list of selected stories taught as near as might be in fixed words, so that there is no reason to suppose that they underwent any serious change in the course of the Apostolic age.'

This accords with what I have been teaching for thirty years. But oral teaching was of two kinds: (1) the fixed tradition committed to memory; (2) stories repeated so often that they assume a stereotyped form. Dr. Stanton recognizes the latter only. He follows the late Bishop Westcott in hold-

ing that the oral teaching was given with considerable variations at first, but assumed a fixed form through frequent repetition, exactly as a teller of stories now begins badly but polishes and improves until he reaches perfection and then adheres to one form. This view, however, ignores the simple fact that though one man can trust his memory so far, he has no power of transmitting to others his facility except within very narrow limits. When I was a curate in London I could repeat the Marriage Service from beginning to end without book. Though I had made no effort to learn it, frequent repetition had made me perfect. But I could not transmit this power. Every man must begin at the beginning and learn for himself. The simplest, shortest, and only satisfactory way is for each man to commit the words to memory. During the oral period thirty or forty Churches needed a knowledge of the word. Children must be taught; teachers must be found. It was impossible for St. Peter to go the round of all the Hebrew Churches, or St. Mark the round of all the Greek Churches. It is certain that they did not do this. And why should they, when the Metropolitan Church had scores of duly equipped Catechists who were burning with zeal to 'make one proselyte'?

This question of learning by heart is fundamental, and therefore I make no apology for insisting on it. But there are a few other questions which Dr. Stanton raises, about which I have something to say.

He holds that St. Mark's Gospel had no Aramaic basis, but was composed in Greek from the first for the use of the Greek-speaking Jews of Cæsarea and elsewhere, because the Jews of Jerusalem, having known our Lord in the flesh, had no need of instruction in His history. The *Logia* were drawn up for their use, St. Mark's history for outsiders. In teaching thus, Dr. Stanton sets aside the earliest evidence which we possess on this question, namely, the fragment of Papias, preserved for us in Eusebius (*Hist.* III. xxxix. 15). Papias, I submit, means that while St. Peter appointed St. Mark to translate the Aramaic lessons into Greek, St. Matthew made no such appointment, but left the work of translating to volunteers, several of whom essayed it with varying success. Sometimes two or more versions were made of the same passage. In this way arose the puzzles with which the critic is confronted. I am as reluctant as Dr. Sanday is to throw Papias overboard. But I have another reason for objecting to the idea that St. Mark's Gospel had no Aramaic basis. Granted that the men of Jerusalem—many of them—knew our Lord and recollected enough of His acts to appreciate the *Logia* and hear sermons: they had children, who did not. And if oral teaching was chiefly a matter for boys, it was quite as necessary in Jerusalem as elsewhere. Indeed, it was more necessary in proportion as the Metropolitan Church was large, and its members strong and able to make known their needs and to demand satisfaction. The Church insisted on the necessity of religious education as strongly as it does now.

Dr. Stanton thinks that the second source (the *Logia*) originated in Jerusalem, but the first did not, because otherwise the two could not have been kept separate. I have shown reason to think that the art of conflation began in Jerusalem at a very early date, though it did not make much progress there for some time, but I see no reason why St. Peter and St. Matthew should not have taught in the same city. St. Peter's energy and example may have stirred up St. Matthew's zeal. In the University of Cambridge there are six divinity professors who teach in friendly concert. Students go first to one, then to another. What should have hindered them from doing so in Jerusalem of old?

Dr. Stanton holds that during the oral stage the second source was not translated into Greek in its entirety, but only in such parts as suited the needs of Gentiles. In particular, he holds that our Lord's teaching about the relation of the Old Testament to the New (Mt 5^{17-47}) would not interest Gentiles. To me it seems that the Gentiles were particularly in need of this teaching. The Old Testament was their Bible—their only Bible: what were they to do with it? To take it literally and at full length was obviously impossible: to ignore it was still more impossible. If St. Paul had been acquainted with the verses in question, he would have been saved many anxious arguments. Belief in a proto-Mark suggests belief in a proto-Matthew. A critic who works on the documentary hypothesis has a natural objection to multiply documents: on the oral hypothesis a proto-Matthew is just as easy to assume as a proto-Mark. The later sections of the *Logia* were unknown to St. Luke (except a few fragments) because he tapped the source at an earlier date.

Dr. Stanton holds that the Hellenists at Jerusalem were so few in number, or stayed in the city so short a time, that they may be neglected. To me it seems certain from Ac 6 that in the early days they were particularly strong. How came they to murmur against the Hebrews? Why did St. Peter change his practice at their demand? Why did all the seven bursars bear Greek names? If the Hellenists were not actually in a majority, it looks as though they carried the election—perhaps because many of the Hebrews were too lethargic to vote. It is a common mistake, which I am far from attributing to Dr. Stanton, to suppose that speaking Greek was the test of an Hellenist. If that were true, St. Paul was an Hellenist, though he styles himself a Hebrew of Hebrews. An Hellenist was a progressive Jew, and these progressives would naturally be the first to welcome Christianity. The Church at Jerusalem was captured by the Pharisees at a slightly later date, but the more liberal element prevailed (as we should expect) at first. But if the 'Grecians' did not always speak Greek, they had a smattering of it and a liking for it. They supported those who did speak it. If such men were defrauded of portions of the *Logia*, they would have murmured, not merely that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration of bread, but that their souls were neglected in the ministry of the word.

Dr. Stanton accuses me of an anachronism in holding that the Synoptic Gospels were read aloud in churches according to a table of lessons. That they were read, I suppose he would allow: why not according to a table? Such tables were used in the synagogues, and the church was modelled on the synagogue. Because the Gospels, he says, were in process of growth, whereas I am assuming that they were complete. I certainly assume that they were practically complete as soon as the three or four sources were blended into one Gospel. After that a good deal of polishing was done, but not many new sections added. We are agreed that all three Synoptic Gospels were published, probably, in the decade 70–80 A.D., but at what date were they put into oral form? I submit that their eschatological sections determine this. St. Mark collects all his eschatology into chap. 13, which deals almost exclusively with the destruction of the temple, but in vv.[24-27] with the larger question of the end of the world. St. Luke copies that chapter with but a few editorial changes, evidently made (as Dr. Stanton allows) after the event. He gives, in a new conflation, our Lord's teaching about the end of the world. Now contrast St. Matthew: he collects all that he records about the destruction of the temple and the end of the world into one huge conflation, and by altering the introductory question of the disciples, makes the two events synchronous. Would any Evangelist have done this when time had shown that the two events were not at all synchronous? I trow not. But if the conflation was made and put into circulation throughout the Eastern Churches before 66 A.D., then when the crash came the Evangelist might naturally decide that it was too late to alter the chapters. More injury to the faith would be done by breaking up the records and readjusting them, than by letting them stand and dealing with them by exegesis, as the modern commentator does.

But if that conflation was made before 66 A.D., the other four conflations in St. Matthew were probably still earlier. Hence the oral stage of the comparatively perfect Gospel lasted twelve years or more—quite long enough for the formation of a table of lessons. When the second revolution came and every Church used four Gospels instead of one only, a clean sweep was made of old customs. But even Justin Martyr's assertion that the Gospels were read in Churches as far as was convenient, need not imply that each reader was left free to go on as long as he thought fit. Lawlessness was not usual in ancient days.

Dr. Stanton questions whether I was in a position to speak for Dr. Westcott's later opinions about the oral Gospel. He strangely forgets that oral communications are possible even now. It was in a private conversation in 1889 that Dr. Westcott spoke to me with impressive earnestness about his unshaken confidence in the truth of that hypothesis.

Professor Gwatkin observes that of course other forces were at work in moulding the Gospels. That is certainly true, as the Dean of Westminster, Dr. Sanday, and others have insisted. Twenty years ago, being too much under Dr. Westcott's influence, I attributed to defects of memory many changes which, I have now learned, were made deliberately. I venture to point out the following forces:—(1) Theological timidity, which altered St. Mark in places where his assertion of the truth of our Lord's humanity might be used by the

enemy to deny His divinity. Under this heading may be also classed instances where changes have been made to save the characters of the Twelve. (2) The desire to point out the fulfilment of Scripture. The trito-Mark does this several times, quietly and without note: St. Matthew does it ostentatiously. (3) Paulinism. A large number of St. Paul's distinctive words and ideas have been introduced by the trito-Mark and by others. (4) Stylistic changes, to make the Gospels better adapted to Church reading. (5) Editorial corrections, additions, and explanations. Some of these are not improvements. For example, the trito-Mark tells us that Abiathar was high priest when David ate the shew-bread: St. Matthew asserts that the Zachariah who perished between the altar and the sanctuary was son of Barachiah: St. Luke declares that the three hours' darkness was due to an eclipse of the sun during the Passover full moon. To some of us it is a relief to regard these statements as the mistakes of an editor.

Like other critics who accept the documentary hypothesis, Dr. Stanton accounts for a large number of variations by assuming that the same utterance was found in two sources. I admit that this was probably a *vera causa*, but I am very reluctant to allow it a wide range. It may be true of one or two cases, but the oral hypothesis does not require more. In fact, the oral hypothesis gives liberty to the critic. But in all hypothetical work we must remember that we are not dealing with certainties. Nor is the most simple and natural explanation necessarily true. The improbable (as Aristotle reminds us) frequently happens. Long experience has taught me to write 'may' where others are too apt to write 'must.'

A complex problem cannot admit of a simple solution. Those who offer such a solution neglect some factors in the problem.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Theology of Bellarmine.[1]

M. DE LA SERVIÈRE'S copious and learned work belongs to the Library of Historical Theology now being issued under the direction of the Faculty of the Catholic Institute of Paris. The series has already been enriched by works on the theology of Tertullian and Hippolytus, besides other more general studies. The present monograph is based chiefly on Cardinal Bellarmine's famous and most characteristic work, the *Disputationes de controversiis christianæ fidei adversus hujus temporis hereticos*, published in three volumes from 1586 to 1593. That book was the outcome of eleven years' lecturing in the newly founded *Collegium Romanum* in Rome. Bellarmine was above all an untiring controversialist; polemic drew forth all his powers, and in that age gave him a brilliant opportunity for the display of amazing talents. His clarity of thought, orderliness of mind, and phenomenal argumentative dexterity were cordially acknowledged even by his foes. His *Disputationes* became a veritable arsenal for the militant Romanist. The need for such a manual had been long felt. What the champions of Rome lacked, remarks M. de la Servière, was 'a great work in which, alongside of the enemy's objections faithfully reproduced, they might find a clear and complete exposition of Catholic dogma and its proofs,' with all weapons of attack or defence ranged in order. The supply of this want they gratefully owed to Bellarmine.

His teaching on the infallibility of the Pope would be called moderate to-day. It is to be found in the five books devoted by him to the subject of 'the Roman Pontiff,' of which M. de la Servière offers us an excellent survey. Christ, we are told, meant His Church to be a monarchy. For unity and order the monarch must be visible, and in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel, with its 'Feed my sheep,' we see our Lord setting Peter upon the throne, and investing him with supreme power over the Church. It is harder to prove that the Roman bishops are Peter's true successors, and certainly nothing that could be called proof is furnished here. It is conceded, however, that a heretical Pope may be deposed—for an extremely ingenious reason, namely, that in virtue of his open

[1] *La Théologie de Bellarmin.* Par J. de la Servière, S.J. Paris: G. Beauchesne & Cie. Prix 8 francs.

heresy he has ceased *ipso facto* to be Pope, as having even ceased to be a Christian; therefore the Church may rightly judge and punish him. Bellarmine has an easier task in making out that the Pope is not Antichrist. He protests quite fairly that Antichrist in St. Paul is a single person, not a series of persons.

Next he deals with the Roman Pontiff as the supreme judge in all controversies. He allows that the Pope may err in matters of fact which depend on human testimony. Not only so; the Pope, as *doctor privatus*, may err in general questions of faith and morals. (And here M. de la Servière takes occasion to regret that Bellarmine did not make a clearer distinction between two different things: dogmatic facts, in regard to which the infallibility of the Church comes into operation, and simple facts of history, as to which the judgment of the Church is fallible.) But the Pope cannot become an open heretic, in the sense of stubbornly holding that which is contrary to the faith. Bishops have their jurisdiction not from the apostles, but directly from the Pope; the apostles, indeed, were subject to Peter's judicial supervision. At this point occurs the singular assertion that Peter presided over the Council at Jerusalem (Ac $15^{28.29}$). Nothing, we feel, can be too hard for an historical method which permits such forms of reasoning.

Finally, the power of the Pope in temporal matters is virtually affirmed to be unlimited. It is a power, however, which he possesses only indirectly. Directly, he has authority in spiritual things alone. But just as the soul has a body, so spiritual power is everywhere accompanied by temporal power, for nothing temporal can be imagined which may not concern the welfare of souls. Here is the argument in a nutshell, so far as it affects politics. "It is the duty of a Christian people to reject a heretical or unbelieving prince, who endeavours to draw away his subjects into heresy or unbelief. Now, it is to the Pope, as bound to watch over the interests of religion, that it belongs to decide whether a king is, or is not, guilty of this crime; *hence it is to him that it belongs to decide whether the prince ought or ought not to be dispossessed of his throne.*' When the Pope crowned Charlemagne he transferred the headship of the Empire from the Greeks to the Germans. This declaration as to the universal political authority of the Pope will bear thinking over, even to-day. What light does it throw, for example, on the contents of the Coronation Oath?

M. de la Servière writes with so much unobtrusive learning, tact, and sympathy that we feel ourselves to be, at every point, in immediate contact with Bellarmine's mind. He does not scruple to mark the Cardinal's occasional blunders, and he renders his numerous quotations into fluent and limpid French. In every case of importance the Latin original appears below. We have no space to characterize the later parts of the book, especially the important chapters which discuss Bellarmine's views of the sacraments, of sin, and of grace. But it may safely be said that nothing of real consequence has been omitted.

Bellarmine has the great merit as a controversialist of stating the other side fully and fairly. Indeed, so true and exhaustive were his reports of Lutheran opinions, that heads were shaken in Catholic Italy over the wide circulation of his book. Here we may still learn from him. It will not suffice, as is done in too much polemic, to confront Catholic realities with Protestant ideals; ideals *or* facts on both sides is the only true way. He still gives furiously to think, moreover, on the question of authority in religion. No one saw with more piercing vision the weakness of a Protestantism built upon an external view of Scripture. How to distinguish Canon and Apocrypha; how to prove infant baptism from the New Testament; how to decide which is the right interpretation of a given passage—these and such like were the problems forced on Lutherans and Calvinists by the shrewd lawyer-like Italian; and the modern Protestant will do wisely to make sure that he has sound answers ready, for they may be wanted any day.

H. R. Mackintosh.

Edinburgh.

The Russian Sects.[1]

Dr. Karl Grass continues his exhaustive work upon the Russian Sects. These contributions will

[1] *Die Russischen Sekten.* Von Mag. Theol. Karl Konrad Grass, Privatdozent in Dorpat. Zweiter Band. Die Weissen Tauben oder Skopzen nebst Geistlichen Skopzen, Neuskopzen u. a. Erste Hälfte: Geschichte der Sekte bis zum Tode des Stifters. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909.

be of great value to all those interested in the history of religions. Up to the present time the works in Russian on the subject were sealed books owing to that language being so little studied. Dr. Grass not only translates from books and documents, but collects a great mass of material from oral communication, magazines, and songs of the people. He dismisses at the beginning any attempts to treat the subject with reference to old forms of that gloomy superstition of self-mutilation which was known among the ancients and, indeed, in the earliest times. He confines himself entirely to its development in Russia. It seems clear that it is connected with the beliefs of the Khlists. The sect is first mentioned about 1770, and in 1772 we have a Ukaz against it in the reign of the Empress Catherine. The oldest book on the sect, entitled *An Investigation into the Heresy of the Skoptsi*, is by Nadezhdin, and was published in 1845. This was supplemented by P. Melnikov's letters on the Raskol, 1862, and materials for the history of the Khlists and Skoptsi. Nadezhdin was chosen by General Perovski to write the account, as the Emperor Nicholas I. did not like the subject being treated by Dahl, who had at first been selected. He was a Lutheran, and the Orthodox Church appeared at a disadvantage. A great deal of information is given in Kelsiev's book on the Raskolniks. This caused the doctrines to be more familiar in the West, as Kelsiev's book was, unless our memory fails us, made the subject of an article by the late W. Ralston. The founder of the sect remains to a certain extent in obscurity. It is supposed to have been one Kondrati Selivanov. Another founder is mentioned, Andrei Ivanov, but he disappears early from the scene, having been banished to Siberia. The names of four persons are mixed up with these claimants, who were merely tramps (*Landstreicher*), as Dr. Grass calls them. The heresy rapidly spread, and the ignorant common people even supposed that the Emperor Peter III. was their patron. We know that the Raskolniks formed a very powerful adjunct to the forces of the rebel Pugachev, who was himself one. Pushkin tells us that an old woman said to him, when he was collecting material for his *History of the Insurrection*, 'You call him a rebel, but we think he is our real Emperor.'

The latter sections of this part, from p. 384 to the end, tell of the Skoptsi in the reign of the Emperor Nicholas, who had a very drastic way of dealing with these heretical questions. The popular songs translated by Dr. Grass are very curious. The work is treated entirely in an historical spirit. The adventures of the Skoptsi in all parts of Russia are investigated with minute accuracy.

W. R. Morfill.

Oxford.

In the Study.

A Study in the Golden Art of Self-Encouragement.

The Rev. Dinsdale T. Young has published a volume of sermons which he pleasantly calls 'A Book of Evangelical Cheer.' But the title of the book is curious. It is *The Gospel of the Left Hand* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). That is the title of the first sermon, and the text is 'On the left hand, where he doth work (Job 23^9). Those who buy the book will read that sermon in connexion with the 'Studies in Failure,' but it is not that sermon we are concerned with at present.

It is a sermon in the middle of the volume, which goes by the title of 'The Golden Art of Self-Encouragement.' And the text is as good as the title: 'But David encouraged himself in the Lord his God' (1 S 30^6).

It was that time in which David's fortunes were at their lowest ebb. Hunted by Saul from place to place, he had at last taken refuge among the Philistines. And his faithful band of adherents had followed him. It was an act of amazing hardihood. But it seemed at first to be successful. David and his men, with their wives and families, were received by Achish and settled in the town of Ziklag. Then the Philistines gathered their armies and went up to fight against Israel, and David and his men passed on in the rereward with Achish. The situation was sufficiently trying, but they could not help themselves. Fortunately, however, the

lords of the Philistines would have none of them, and they were sent back to Ziklag.

When they reached Ziklag, they found the place in flames. A band of Amalekites had raided the South, and finding Ziklag deserted of men had burned it, carrying the women and children away with them. The surprise was overwhelming. The men that were with David 'lifted up their voice and wept, until they had no more power to weep.' Then they threatened to stone him. But David encouraged himself in the Lord his God.

'He ran to his cordial,' says John Trapp. 'When he was at his wits' end he was not at his faith's end,' is the comment of Matthew Henry. Mr. Young takes three words out of the verse to look at separately. (1) He encouraged *himself*. He had often encouraged others. He had sometimes received encouragement from others. Now he addressed himself to himself. 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me?' (2) *His God*. So he had a God. He had a God of his own before the moment came when he so greatly needed Him. You cannot extemporize consolation, says Mr. Young. Have your cordial handy that you may fly to it when you need it. (3) The third word is *but*. The rest had all lost heart; *but* David encouraged himself in the Lord. That 'but' saved the situation. Everything begins with *but*, every good thing and every evil thing.

Then Mr. Young makes use of this matter of self-encouragement in God for our encouragement and growth in grace. He considers—

1 The times for it.—There is the time of *personal sorrow*. David's sorrow was the deeper that he had brought sorrow upon others also. He was a lonely stricken man, and lonely stricken men were round him. Social distress is another time. What is our remedy for the ills that we see around us? Legislation? That is not enough. They need sympathy. They need our God. Another time is when the *ill effects of the past* come down upon us. Should David really have been in Ziklag? Should he have gone up with the Philistines? But we need not upbraid him. With us also has the Lord been long-suffering.

2. The reasons for it.—The first reason is that we so often find there is no encouragement in man. The next, that we have had knowledge of God's ways with us. We have found, as Spurgeon says, that 'He sometimes sends His love-letters in black-edged envelopes.' And then there are His promises. 'Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure.'

3. The methods of it.—The first method is prayer. This method, says Mr. Young, is perennially efficacious; its sovereign force persists through all time. This was David's own method. 'David,' we read in v.[8], 'inquired of the Lord.' Another method is personal effort. When the Psalmist says, 'My soul wait thou with patience,' his word 'wait' is not a passive word. It is indeed very active and energetic. David *encouraged himself* in the Lord. A third method is by hunting in the Book. It was Bunyan that said he hunted in the Book 'for a word to lean a weary soul on.'

4. The benefits of it.—The first benefit is that he who encourages himself is able to encourage others. David persuaded his men, in place of stoning him, to follow him against the Amalekites. And they recovered all that belonged to them. And then there is this other benefit that we actually find the encouragement. In three days Saul was dead, and David was on the way to the kingdom. The encouragement does not always come so immediately or so literally. But it comes.

Studies in Failure.

II.

Christ's Way with Failures.

Lk 15[2], 'This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them.'

When the King, according to the parable, filled his wedding with guests from the highways, and declared that those who were first invited were not worthy, he turned the failures of life into successes, and the successes into failures. But before we deal with this remarkable reversal of human judgment and human lot, it is necessary that we should consider how He brought it about.

Among the books of last month there was a volume of sermons by the Rev. Henry W. Clark, entitled *Laws of the Inner Kingdom* (Robert Scott; 3s. 6d. net). One of the sermons in the volume is on 'Christ's Treatment of Sinners.' In that sermon Mr. Clark says that 'it is one of the test questions in regard to any system which professes to deal with men and women as a whole, whether the

system be social, educational, or religious—what has it got to say about the failures?' It may have nothing to say about them. It may simply pass them by. Or if it recognizes them, it may have nothing hopeful to say about them. It may have no confidence that it has found the secret of their help and redemption, and content itself with pitying words and sympathetic looks. This is a test question. And it gains in interest if among the failures we recognize ourselves—if, in short, it deals with life on its moral and spiritual side, the side on which consciousness of failure is most pronounced in us all. How does the gospel of Christ stand this test?

1. First of all, Christ makes humanity in its spiritual failure the *special object* of His ministries. He came to seek and to save the lost. He came not to call the righteous, but sinners. The specific charge made against His life and conduct was that He ate and drank with publicans and sinners.

This was a new method. It is not accepted outside Christianity yet. Mr. Clark says that the utmost that can be done by the best schemes of social progress which human minds devise is to be as lenient to the individual failures as is consistent with the good of the race. Is there room left for them? It is only after the successful have all taken their places at the table. When they have fallen, is there a chance left open to them to rise again? 'Fix the difference in your minds between leaving another chance for the spiritual failures and *living for* the spiritual failures.'

It is an amazing misapprehension of the Christ of the Gospels which is made by Mr. H. G. Wells in his book called *First and Last Things*, when he represents the Christian's Christ as 'too fine' for him. In a volume of essays, called, from the title of the first and longest essay, *The Religion of H. G. Wells* (Fisher Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. A. H. Craufurd, M.A., has criticized this blunder with sufficient courtesy. 'I am quite sure,' he says, 'that He would not have seemed too fine for the writer whom I am now criticizing, if only that writer could have been present at some of the friendly ministrations of the sympathetic prophet of Nazareth. Mr. Wells is manifestly friendly to sinners; so he would not sympathize in the least with the harsh and Judaic attack of the late Mr. Cotter Morison on the all-pitying tenderness of Jesus for the weak, the erring, and the lost. Mr. Morison's indictment of the apparently antinomian compassion of Christ may serve at least to show that Christ *did* thoroughly sympathize with many of the most lawless characters of His age and nation, that, in a sense, the Pharisees were right in regarding Him as a friend of publicans and sinners in a very close and very intimate way. Mr. Cotter Morison's harsh Judaic venom was poured out on our Lord chiefly on account of his *special* love for sinners. This special and clinging love seemed to this pharisaical and dry-as-dust moralist a downright insult to morality. He even censured Jesus for pardoning the penitent thief on the cross without forcing him first to make amends to the society he had injured, as if any man with a human heart would not judge that crucifixion itself was a far *too* severe punishment for theft, as if it had been in any way *possible* for the suffering thief in his last agony to make the amends demanded there and then.'

2. The second remark to make about Christ's way with the failures is that He counts upon some response to His appeals. He 'believes that in all men there dwells something which can respond to a spiritual quickening impulse.' For if Christ did not stint His ministries, neither would He have wasted them. Mr. Clark thinks that this 'supreme hopefulness' of Christ is not sufficiently considered. Human sin drove Christ to a cross; but the Christ whom it drove to the cross did not think that He was wasting His ministries on sinfulness so extreme. 'As to human possibilities, He knew not a moment's despair; and, right as we are in insisting on the supreme importance of man's faith in Christ, something needs also to be said about Christ's faith in man.'

There is another newly published volume of sermons by another preacher, which contains an able sermon on this subject. The preacher is the Rev. W. L. Watkinson; the volume, *The Fatal Barter* (Culley; 3s. 6d.), and the sermon is called 'Christ and Abnormal Life.' Mr. Watkinson occupies himself with the things which Christ saw in sinners to make Him have hope for them.

1. He saw *Reason*. By reason Mr. Watkinson means, not the logical faculty, but reason on its spiritual side, the spiritual imagination, perception and sensibility, which recognize God and the eternal universe. Men may lose sight of God and wander in the far country, but they are still conscious of the throb of the eternal. In his *Travels on the Amazons*, Bates tells of his astonish-

ment in discovering, when far in the interior, a slight rise and fall of the water in a small creek which traversed the forest. He was nearly six miles up country, and he hesitated to believe that at such a distance it was possible for the sea to make itself felt. But it was really so. 'Yes, the tide! the throb of the great oceanic pulse felt far away in a remote corner,' leagues away from the place where the sea strikes the mouth of the Amazon.

2. He saw *Conscience*. There is a terrible indictment of the Gentile world in the opening of the Epistle to the Romans. Burke said it was difficult to draw up an indictment against a whole nation, but the Apostle draws up an indictment against the race. But what immediately follows? The question of conscience. Throughout the mighty moral debasement conscience continued to do its office, and to it Paul makes his confident appeal. Christ appealed to the conscience by the warmth of His presence. He abode that day at the house of Zacchæus, and salvation came that day to his house. In the far North the quicksilver freezes in the thermometer, which, of course, ceases to register, and whilst the cold continues even for months and years the instrument remains useless; but let the temperature rise, and the quicksilver becomes at once nimble and indicative.

3. He saw *Affection*. We speak of heartless people, but it is a figure of speech that is never wholly applicable. A city missionary has stated that what impressed him most in prosecuting his work in dark neighbourhoods was 'the goodness of the bad.'

4. He saw *Will*. It often seems as though men had utterly lost will-power to all that is good. If the will is the centre of personality, it looks as though some in human shape were only phantoms. But our Lord always assumed that the most impotent of men possessed will-power, however long it had remained unused. 'I will arise and go to my father,' said the prodigal in his deepest degradation; and Christ did not put that word into his mouth without purpose.

The French record a striking story respecting a peasant girl who was repeatedly found guilty of stealing flowers, and, in consequence, condemned to one of the prisons of Paris. Touching this form of crime the culprit was manifestly insane and incorrigible. A director of prison-labour set the convicts to make artificial flowers, and this demented girl among the rest. She was delighted, enthusiastically making roses from morning to night. As she continued her joyous task her mental maladies ceased, and she was discharged from prison sane and happy, to become one of the most successful florists in Paris.

3. The third remark is that when Christ turned failure into success, there was no mistake about the success. His faith in man and man's faith in himself are a great contrast. What is the loftiest spiritual hope we are still content to cherish? To be not quite shut out from the heaven of good; to find at least standing-room just within its gates. Christ sat down beside the sinners, not that they might be driven to despair by the contrast, but that they might be lifted to the same height of holiness. He believed that in contact with spiritual perfectness lay the sinner's hope. The darkened heart and the soiled nature and the lame deformed humanity found their best impulse in having near them the contrast of a Christ.

Two Studies in Biography.

I.

Blaise Pascal.

It is difficult to estimate the ordinary book as it comes. It is difficult to prophesy its future. Books are like poets: only posterity can put them in their place. Yet occasionally, though it be only once in a season, the great book comes, and the critic turns into a prophet without fear. It comes when a man has given himself wholly and whole-heartedly to a subject; and when he has ability, industry, and earnestness enough.

Viscount St. Cyres is identified with Pascal and Port Royal, so that those who know either cannot help thinking of the other. He has made the whole Jansenist movement his own. After particular inquiry we are able to say that there is no higher authority on the subject in any country at the present time.

And then we can read his book with such abounding pleasure. Not that it is well written, as the word is commonly used. There are felicities of style, but there are also idiosyncrasies, and the author would not be chosen as a model of composition. But a very little experience of it makes one sit back satisfied that the style is suitable to the subject, and that altogether this book is to

mark an event in one's experience. The title is simply *Pascal* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 10s. 6d. net).

Two things may be touched upon. Let the first be Pascal's conversion.

What is conversion? Viscount St. Cyres is ready for his part to adopt the definition of Professor William James. 'To be converted, to receive grace, to experience religion,' says Professor James, 'are so many phrases which denote the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self, hitherto divided and consciously wrong, inferior, and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior, and happy.' But this is to define conversion by its results. What is it that brings conversion about, and how does that thing operate in bringing it about? Again, Viscount St. Cyres seems content with Professor James. 'Perhaps,' he says, 'the best answer will be found in modern theories of subliminal consciousness. Much of our thinking is done without our knowledge. Ideas lodge, strike root, and ripen in the mind without attracting more than our most casual attention, until they suddenly spring on us full-grown, as did Minerva from the brain of Jove. Nay, in certain exceptional persons whole networks of ideas and desires—a second character, in fact—may form beneath the usual self, much as the new skin of a snake grows up beneath the old. In due time the old skin cracks, rends, is sloughed off, and the animal emerges fresh and glossy in his summer dress. So is it with the convert.' In another place he even goes the length of saying, 'There is nothing mysterious about it. It may be expressed in terms of physiology, and Pascal himself would not have objected to have it so explained'—but he immediately adds—'so long as physiology added that the last term in the series was the grace of God, adapting itself to the natural workings of the human machine.'

What, then, is the grace of God? The phrase in Jansen's day was 'irresistible grace.' Jansen accepted 'irresistible grace'; but he said that irresistible grace was only a technical academic name for irresistible love, and a Christian's love for God was just as 'natural,' just as much a part of himself, as Romeo's for Juliet. And it was 'irresistible' in precisely the same sense as the love that drove Antigone to disobey the orders of her king was resistless in the fight, *ἀνίκατος μάχαν*. But how or why the love arose—why it called one and not another—neither Sophocles, nor Shakespeare, nor Saint Cyran could explain. All the Jansenist convert knew was that the love was there. All in a moment he was 'touched by God.' He was caught up into the grip of a mysterious Power; some strange, spiritual chemistry blotted out his former tastes and inclinations, and left him a new being. What could he do but render grateful thanks to God? And with all that Viscount St. Cyres seems to agree.

The other subject is Jesuitism. Two words make the sum of its meaning—obedience and casuistry. First obedience, 'How was a man to know for certain what God expected of him? Let him join the Society, and he would soon find out. There a perpetual ladder of communication ran between earth and heaven. The individual Jesuit obeyed his Superior, who obeyed the Rector, who obeyed the Provincial, who obeyed the General, who obeyed the Pope, who took his orders straight from God Almighty. Thus obedience became the pivot of the Jesuit system, although it was far from being a Jesuit invention. Ever since the days of St. Benedict it had ranked, together with poverty and chastity, as one of the cardinal virtues of monasticism; and even Loyola's famous simile, *perinde ac cadaver*—like a carcase in the hands of the superior—comes from the Franciscans. But in the Society obedience soon cast its companion virtues into the shade. "We heard comparatively little of poverty or chastity," writes a former novice, "but every hour of the day we were reminded of obedience. No boundaries were set to this virtue; it was infinite space for ever enlarging."'

Next, casuistry. But to understand what Pascal made of Jesuit casuistry, to understand what Viscount St. Cyres makes of what Pascal made of it, one must read the two great chapters on the Provincial Letters. It was not original to Loyola, any more than was obedience. He adopted it to checkmate that 'spiritual sense' upon which the Reformers relied. Viscount St. Cyres has just introduced the subject when he gives as good an example of the use of it as will be found. He takes it from the Memoirs of Madame de Motteville, the very orthodox lady-in-waiting to Queen Anne of Austria. 'Like most Spaniards, Anne was fond of the play. But in the summer of 1646, the curé of St. Germain, a pious and austere divine, wrote to point out that she endangered her soul every time she set foot within a theatre. His

letter rather troubled her conscience, and she consulted several bishops, who thought that listening to Corneille was not necessarily a sin. But the curé persisted all the more, and sent her a written opinion against the lawfulness of the play countersigned by seven doctors of divinity. Thereupon she consulted the young King's tutor, the Abbé Beaumont de Péréfixe. Off posted Péréfixe to the Sorbonne, and soon came back with at least ten signatures on the other side. Seven from ten left a majority of three in favour of the play, and the Queen's scruples were at once appeased; though her lady-in-waiting indulges in a mild lament over the degenerate laxity of modern times. But neither Anne, nor Madame de Motteville, nor the curé, nor the tutor saw anything odd in deciding an important case of conscience by votes casually lobbied in the Sorbonne.'

II.

Ignatius Loyola.

This life of the founder of the Jesuits has been written by Francis Thompson the poet. Its title is *Saint Ignatius Loyola* (Burns & Oates; 10s. 6d. net).

Now anything whatever written by Francis Thompson will receive attention. This book will be looked into by many. Few of those who look into it will fail to read it to the end. It is not a large book. It is handsomely printed, and yet more handsomely illustrated. But most of all, there is an individuality about the style of the writing, an individuality which gives the book real distinction. It will afford sincere pleasure to those who know Francis Thompson only from his poetry to find that he was also a master of prose.

Take one isolated paragraph as evidence: 'This man [the man is Loyola], as we have said, held native kindred with the Raleighs and Sidneys, the poet-soldiers and statesmen of our own sixteenth century. Nay, the little imaginative strain, so scorned of our petty day, inhered in all the lofty souls of that age. It is in the English martyr, bowing his head to the axe of Elizabeth: "Though I shall have a sharp dinner, I trust in Christ I shall have a most sweet supper." It is in his brother-sufferer, pointing at foot of the scaffold to his last sun: "I shall shortly be above yon fellow!" The splendid familiarity of the utterance recalls Falstaff's arrogant terming of the stars "the cinders of the element." Poet, Saint, and Martyrs shared the noble imaginative elevation of their era, in which the spirit of the Goth and the whole once-barbaric West culminated alike for good and evil. Even the Saints of our day speak a less radiant language, and sanctity shows, "shorn of its rays" through the black fog of universal utilitarianism, the materiality which men have drawn into the very lungs of their souls.'

But now to Loyola. How difficult it is to do justice to the founder of Jesuitism. And to come to the book, as we have done, from revelling in a great life of Pascal, doubles the difficulty. But it increases the interest. Especially when we find that this whole-hearted adorer of 'the Saint,' as he devotedly calls him, is able, without driving us off, to rejoice in the very features of Jesuitism which have made it a byword and a hissing. It is in our power to explain the acceptance of these things by a man like Francis Thompson on the supposition that he never really had the opportunity of studying Jesuitism as a system, never the opportunity of knowing what its doctrine of obedience meant to the soul of the man who obeyed, or its doctrine of accommodation to the soul of the man who had sinned. For it is Loyola himself and not his order that caught the imagination of this poet; and the books he read (and he read many books), were read in order that he might know more of 'the Saint,' and let the world know. We may therefore read this book with pleasure without learning to love Jesuitism any more, though we shall probably be unable to read it without learning to love Saint Ignatius Loyola somewhat.

Is there no Atonement?

By the Very Rev. John L. Darby, D.D., Dean of Chester.

'For the modern Jew there is no atonement. He is a sinner like the Gentile, and needs forgiveness. He believes that he obtains forgiveness simply by repentance.' So Dr. Adler, the Chief Rabbi. He, however, is not of the modern Jews who reject the Old Testament. On the contrary, he quotes Ex 32, and refers to the words of Moses in v.[30]. He holds that the answer of Jehovah signifies that He did not accept the idea of Atonement, and in that answer Dr. Adler finds the answer to every one who says that there is a doctrine of the Atonement in the Old Testament.

If Dr. Adler had said that no Atonement would avail for any one who did not repent, we should agree. That is the Christian doctrine, with which, of course, Dr. Adler would not agree; see He 10[14], 'By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are being sanctified.' So St. John (1 Jn 1[7]), 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light . . . the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.' St. Paul (Ro 3[25]), 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith, in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins.' And in Ro 5[10. 11]; 'We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son . . . by whom we have now received the *atonement*,' *i.e.* the *reconciliation*.

But it is difficult to see how Dr. Adler could justify his position when we find the following in the Service for the Day of Atonement in Jews' Prayer Book:[1] 'For on that day shall he (the High Priest) make Atonement for you, to purify you from all your sins before the Lord, and ye shall be clean.' 'O our King, Thou hast vouchsafed us, O Lord our God in love, this Day of Atonement, this day of expiation of iniquity, even this joyful day of an Holy Convocation for remission, forgiveness, expiation, and atonement; and thereon to grant the remission of all our iniquities through love, and Holy Convocation. On that day he shall make Atonement for you, to purify you from all your sins before the Lord, and ye shall be clean. Our God, and the God of our Fathers, shall cause our prayers to ascend and come, approach, be seen, accepted, heard, and thought on, and be remembered in remembrance of us, and in remembrance of our Fathers in remembrance of Jerusalem Thy City, and in the memory of Thy anointed Messias, the Son of David Thy servant, on this Day of Atonement, even on this day of Holy Convocation. Remember us thereon, O Lord our God! for good, and think on us with a blessing.' 'O pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for Thine inheritance. For on this day he (the High Priest) shall make Atonement for you, to purify you from all your sins. Before the Lord ye shall be clean.'

There is also a prayer of the Jews in exile: 'Our God, and the God of our Fathers! By reason of our sins have we been carried captives from our land and removed from our territories, that we are not able to offer sacrifices before Thee, and no priest to make Atonement for us. . . . Let it be Thy Will to gather our dispersions from among the heathens . . . and conduct us, O Lord our God, unto Zion Thy City, that we may there perform in Thy Presence the offering of our duty, the continual sacrifices according to their order, and the additional sacrifices according to their institution; even the additional sacrifices of this Day of Atonement according to what Thou hast written for our observance in Thy Law, by the hands of Moses Thy servant.'

There are many other prayers in the same words, which can bear but one meaning, that the High Priest offered a sacrifice and made atonement, on account of which God Almighty heard the prayer of His faithful people and forgave their sins.

We cannot expect any Jew to understand the Old Testament; the whole meaning is to be found in our Lord Jesus Christ. The High Priest of the Old Dispensation was a representative of the High Priest of our profession; any sacrifice or atonement offered by the High Priest of old was efficacious only as fulfilled in the Great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God (He 4[14]).

But any one reading Lv 16 can see that there was an atonement made by sacrifice for all the congregation of Israel. The word 'Kipper,' translated 'Atonement' in most of the passages, is translated

[1] Printed in London by Richardson. A.M. 5531.

'reconciling' in Lv 16^{20}. As conversely, in Ro 5^{11} the word usually translated 'reconciliation' is translated 'Atonement'—the only place in which the word 'atonement' occurs in the New Testament. Thus we may safely conclude that 'Reconciliation' and 'Atonement' are identical in meaning.

Such passages as 'God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ' (2 Co 5^{18}), and 'He is the propitiation for our sins' (1 Jn 2^{2}), and our Lord's own teaching about His being a ransom, and St. Paul's teaching that it was the sacrifice of the Cross which enabled God to be at once 'just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus' (Ro 3^{26}),—all these passages show that an act was done by Jesus Christ, the only true High Priest, whereby the forgiveness of sin became obtainable on the condition of faith and repentance. That act was His death, the One and Only true Sacrifice, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. We cannot affirm that God could not forgive sins under any other conditions, but we can surely affirm that this was the best conceivable way to effect His purpose. Perhaps without that act man could not have found a motive for repentance, and we know that by that act God commendeth His love towards us, and awakens love in our hearts as the Eternal Spirit makes known to us 'the things that are freely given to us of God' (1 Co 2^{12}).

The other position which Dr. Adler takes as to Prayer, namely, that 'prayer is a self-preached sermon to kindle in our hearts a spark of devotion and enthusiasm,' is as little warranted by the prayers offered by the Jews on the Day of Atonement as his statement that there was no idea of atonement in the Old Testament. The prayer, 'Hear my voice, who heareth all voices, O my God, who receiveth all supplications of them that call upon Thee, who answered Abraham, Isaac, and Israel by granting all their requests,' is enough to rebut such a statement. And the instance, 'Who answered Elijah on Mount Carmel by sending fire from heaven which consumed the sacrifice,' used as a ground of confidence that God would answer prayer, is 'clean contrary' to the idea that prayer is purely subjective. To suppose that prayer is merely an exercise of the mind and heart, educating our nature to higher aspiration, is to mock the God whom we address as Our Father and ask Him to give us all things necessary for our souls and bodies.

Literature.

CONSTANTINOPLE AND ICONIUM.

Sir William Ramsay has published almost simultaneously, but quite independently, two large octavo volumes, one of which is of the very highest scientific value. Let us look at the most valuable volume first. It is entitled *The Thousand and One Churches* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net).

Fifty to sixty miles south-east of Iconium (which, under the name Konia, is still the capital of a great Province, with a railway station) there rises from the level Lycaonian plain an island of volcanic mountains, oval in outline, with the longer axis nearly north and south, called Kara Dagh or Black Mountain. The plain around is approximately 3300 feet above sea-level; while the highest peak of the Kara Dagh rises to a height of nearly 7000 feet. This peak is called Mahaletch. It is crowned by a great church with a small monastery and a memorial chapel attached. Round the base of the northern part of the Kara Dagh, dominated by Mahaletch, there once lay a great city rich and prosperous. The valley is still dotted over with the ruins of it. High above the field of ruins stand a large number of great buildings. These buildings are almost all ecclesiastical, and although the Turks often use the name Kilisse (church) for a ruin which was never a church, yet in this case the name by which the valley is known to the country people, Bin Bir Kilisse, or the Thousand and One Churches, is as suitable as it is picturesque. The only Oriental exaggeration is in the number. There are really only about twenty-eight churches in the valley, and several hundred houses, cisterns, and the like.

In the year 1903 Professor Strzygowski, whose

name (best taken at a gallop) has become familiar to many of our readers by his great article on Muhammadan Art in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, published a book which he called *Kleinasien ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte.* This book was 'the true begetter' of the present volume. For it was the reading of it that impelled Miss Gertrude Bell to visit Bin Bir Kilisse. The visit was made in 1905. Miss Bell got into communication with Sir William Ramsay. It was arranged that he and his wife should join her and explore the valley together. The exploration was carried out in 1907, and then this book was written.

It is a volume for the antiquarian and the architect. There are certainly almost innumerable titbits in it for the student of religion, and there are touches, inseparable from Sir William Ramsay's writing, which give the book a wider human interest. 'This remarkable monument,' says Sir William Ramsay in one place, 'roused in me the moment that I beheld it, a feeling of regret that Dr. Reichel had died before it was discovered. It is a striking confirmation of his theory as to the importance in early Anatolian religion of thrones placed on prominent hills. In a paper published in 1897 he collected many more or less probable examples; but none were so clear and undeniable as this.'

Nevertheless it is a book for the architect and the antiquarian, and it is a book of very great scientific value. The illustrations and plans are numerous, and reproduced with the utmost care. It is divided into four parts, two of which, making together by far the larger part of the volume, have been written by Miss Bell. Indeed, Professor Ramsay is more the editor than the author, as he is quite frank to confess.

The other volume is of less scientific value, but of much more general interest. Its title is *The Revolution in Constantinople and Turkey* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net); and it is further described as 'A Diary by Sir W. M. Ramsay, with Episodes and Photographs by Lady Ramsay.'

To be quite plain, the episodes and photographs are the best of it. One of the latter is of Sir William Ramsay himself, and it is the most lifelike portrait of him we have seen.

Take some sketches out of it at random.

'The Sultan [this is the new Sultan, and the description is in this case by Miss Ramsay] is a large heavy man with a large heavy face, pasty, pale complexion and pendulous cheeks. He wore a khaki uniform coat, and was not (to my mind) either prepossessing or very dignified, though our Turk remarked that he was a fine-looking man, to which we of course assented. I dare say that it is difficult to have a dignified look after being imprisoned and watched by spies constantly for the last thirty-three years.'

'A Krakau shopkeeper once sent to an Oxford friend of mine an article of some value which the latter forgot to pay in the hurry of departure. Months later he returned to Krakau, called at the shop, paid for the article, expressed his regret at the delay, and hoped that the man had not felt disturbed when payment was not made at the time of delivery. "Not at all," said the tradesman; "the English never cheat in small things."'

'I have often noticed that prayers form a most useful instrument of obstruction. You tell a man to do something he does not wish to do, and he forthwith sets up a stick in the ground towards Mecca and proceeds to pray before it. I remember once in a wretched Anatolian guest-house, when a very filthy and objectionable Turk tried to take up his quarters there, and our servants ordered him out, as there was a lady in the chamber, he took up his position before a staff and began to say his prayers; luckily we had an Albanian Moslem servant who was careless of religious duties, and he bundled out the man and his staff very quickly. On board the ships of war, as I am told, prayers are persistently made the excuse by malingerers for shirking all irksome duties.'

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Going through the fourth and fifth volumes, which have reached us together (Funk & Wagnalls), we have been struck with the superiority of the original work over the translations. It is not only more easily read, but it seems to be better worth reading. That does not prove that the American authors are better scholars than the German; because the German work has not only had to be translated, but also to be condensed. But it proves that there are in America not a few competent scholars and capable writers in Biblical

and Theological science, and that it would have been quite possible as well as patriotic to produce a wholly new and original Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge. We should like to make particular mention of the work done by Professor David S. Schaff of Allegheny. The original Schaff-Herzog was conceived and edited by his father. The father's very best work was not better than the son's. He and Professor Gilmore co-operate on the article 'Hymnology,' and into their limited space contrive to pack a great deal of information. The bibliography to this article is particularly full and unusually accurate.

For the bibliographies are not always accurate. We wish the editors would even yet turn their serious attention to that most important matter. We know very well how difficult it is, and the time it occupies, but it is well worth all it costs. An effort is made to mention not only the date but the place of publication of a book. That is highly important, especially in the case of Oriental books. But very often books which are published in London or Edinburgh are said to be published in Boston or New York. It is curious to be told that Leslie Stephen's *Science of Ethics* was published in New York in 1907, when we know that it was published in London in 1882. What is meant, we suppose, is that the second edition of 1907 was imported into New York. The bibliography to the article 'Friendship' begins in this way: 'Cicero and R. W. Emerson, *Friendship: Two Essays*, New York, 1904; H. Black, *Friendship*, ib. 1904.' Now, Cicero's *De Amicitia* was not originally published in New York, and Emerson's Essay on Friendship was not published in 1904; but what we find, and what no doubt is meant to be stated, is that a volume containing a translation of the *De Amicitia*, together with Emerson's Essay, was published by Messrs. Wessels of New York in 1901 (not 1904). Hugh Black's *Friendship* was published in London in 1897.

But what we mean will be better understood if we take a single example. One of the earliest names in the fourth volume is DRIVER. A list of his works is given. It is given in this way. 'He has written: *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (London, 1874); *Isaiah: Life, Times, and Writings which bear his Name* (1888); *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1890); *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, 1891); *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament* (London, 1892); *Deuteronomy* (1895); and *Authority and Archæology, Sacred and Profane* (in collaboration with D. G. Hogarth; 1899). He also edited the commentary of Moses ben Shesheth on Jeremiah and Ezekiel (London, 1871); *The Holy Bible, with various Renderings and Readings from the best Authorities* (1876); *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters* (in collaboration with A. D. Neubauer; 1877); *The Book of Proverbs attributed to Abraham ibn Ezra* (1880); *Leviticus*, in "The Polychrome Bible" (2 vols. 1894–97); *The Parallel Psalter* (1898); *Daniel, Joel, and Amos*, in "The Cambridge Bible for Schools" (Cambridge, 1900–01); *Genesis*, in "The Westminster Commentaries" (London, 1904); *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua*, in R. Kittel's "Biblia Hebraica" (Leipsic, 1905); *The Minor Prophets*, in "The Century Bible" (London, 1906); *The Book of Job* (1906); and *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (1906). He likewise collaborated with F. Brown and C. A. Briggs in *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (12 Parts, Oxford, 1892–1905), and was a member of the editorial board of J. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1898–1904) and of the *Studia Biblica* (Oxford, 1885 sqq.).'

Now, *The Tenses in Hebrew* was originally published in 1874, but that edition was completely superseded by the third edition published in 1892. Indeed, the second edition of 1881 superseded the first. The editors may not think it necessary in giving a list of an author's works to mention later editions than the first; but in the case of a scholar like Driver, who keeps revising his books, it is most important, and all that is necessary is a parenthesis (^{3} 1892). There is a second edition of the *Isaiah* (which belongs to the 'Men of the Bible' series) issued in 1893, and superseding the first edition of 1888. The *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* was first published in 1891, but that edition has been superseded again and again. The sixth edition, issued in 1897, was so thoroughly altered that it had to be re-set. That edition could have been referred to here. But that edition has once more been superseded by the eighth edition, which was issued in September 1909. Of the *Deuteronomy* a second improved edition was issued in 1896. Driver did not write *Authority and Archæology* in collaboration with D. G. Hogarth. He simply wrote the first section

in that volume, of which D. G. Hogarth was the editor. *The Holy Bible with Various Readings*, etc., is not a work of Driver's. The reference is to Eyre & Spottiswoode's *Variorum Teacher's Bible*, of which Driver was only one of five editors. There are two editions of it; the first, published in 1880 (not 1876), was entirely superseded by the enlarged improved edition published in 1893. Neubauer's first name was Adolf, which he usually contracted to Ad. (not A. D.). *Leviticus* in 'The Polychrome Bible' is not in two vols.; two distinct works are referred to, one the Hebrew Leviticus, published simultaneously at Leipzig, Baltimore, and London in 1894, the other the translation of Leviticus, published in New York, London, and Stuttgart in 1898. Both volumes were edited in collaboration with H. A. White. Again, the 1898 edition of the *Parallel Psalter* is superseded by the second edition of 1904. *Daniel, Joel, and Amos* in 'The Cambridge Bible for Schools' reads as if it were one volume. *Joel and Amos* was published in 1897, and *Daniel* in 1900. In mentioning the Westminster *Genesis*, mention should be made also of the Addenda published separately, the second edition, superseding the first, in 1909. Driver edited only the second volume of *The Minor Prophets* in 'The Century Bible,' from Nahum to Malachi. Finally, the *Hebrew Lexicon* was issued in 1906, complete in one handsome volume of 1127 pages, and need not be referred to any longer as in parts.

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS BY A JEW.

It is impossible for any one who professes the Christian name to be uninterested in a movement that is proceeding among the Jews. Something which in Scotland would be called a Disruption has already taken place. And the occasion of it is the Lord Jesus Christ. We do not say that it signifies the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord. But we do say that Jesus Christ is the occasion of the movement, and the centre of it.

One outcome of this movement is a commentary on *The Synoptic Gospels*, by Mr. C. G. Montefiore. The commentary is to appear in three volumes, the third volume consisting of Notes by Mr. Israel Abrahams. The first two volumes, containing the introduction and critical notes by Mr. Montefiore, have been published (Macmillan; 18s. net).

The book is certain to attract attention, and it deserves all the attention that it will attract. Was there ever a Jew before who gave years of his life to the special study of the Gospels? Was there ever a Jew who entered upon the study without prejudice, and carried it through without offence? Mr. Montefiore is an advanced critic of the New Testament, as we know he is an advanced critic of the Old. But, beyond finding him perhaps too advanced for their taste, no English reader will discover a fault in him. His method is first of all to give a new translation of each Gospel, and then, repeating the translation in sections, to comment upon each section critically. Suppose we take as an example of his method the little parable which is found in Mark's Gospel only (4^{26-29}), and which he calls 'the seed that grows of itself.' This is the translation.

'And he said, "The kingdom of God is as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and he sleepeth and ariseth, night and day, and the seed sprouteth and groweth up, he knoweth not how. For of herself the earth bringeth forth her crop; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. But when the crop is ready, immediately he sendeth forth the sickle, because the harvest hath come."'

At first Mr. Montefiore seems to follow Wellhausen, who calls this parable a mere variant of the Sower; but he is evidently not quite satisfied with that; which shows that his instinct is sometimes better than his independence. Then he enters upon what he considers the real difficulty of the parable, that is, the eschatology which it contains. He says, 'If Jesus spoke this parable and the parable of the Sower, can He also have believed that the end would come so quickly, that the new era had, in fact, begun? For in the new era there is no actual development.' The parable, with its far view, cannot be attributed to the early Christians, for, according to Mr. Montefiore and those whom he follows, 'the early Christians were all convinced that the end was at hand.' The conclusion is that perhaps Jesus had both ideas in His mind, and gave expression to them upon different occasions.

Then follow the views of several scholars on this subject—Wellhausen, Loisy, Menzies, Wrede, Johannes Weiss, Jülicher. These views are given with the utmost veracity, and the very fact that they are given, and that Mr. Montefiore has

evidently much difficulty in making up his own mind on the matter, brings out with unmistakable clearness his desire to arrive at the truth without prejudice.

Mr. Montefiore uses Loisy freely, but not too submissively. Wellhausen, on the other hand, he does use submissively. It is his one weakness; and we have much difficulty in forgiving him. For, as Weinel says, Wellhausen's criticism of the Gospels 'has turned out to be almost entirely negative.'

We now await Mr. Abrahams' Notes with much interest.

Perspiration.

The Rev. J. O. Bevan, M.A., F.G.S., F.S.A., Rector of Chillenden, Dover, has reached the age of sixty, and he does not see the use of becoming a sexagenarian unless he can scold somebody for it He scolds his brethren. He scolds them kindly, but unmistakably. He scolds them for perspiring. 'The old-fashioned clergy,' he says, 'would have scorned to indulge in undue haste, but our brethren of the present day are always in a hurry—to catch a train; to sit on a committee; to manage a soup kitchen. And perspiration is a great leveller; it bedews the face and lessens its frigidity; it takes the starch out of the collar; it relaxes the whole man and lowers us sadly in the estimation of our people. Indeed, we may go further and say that the difference between Conservatism and Radicalism is mainly one of perspiration. Conservatives do not perspire—they would not if they could. Who can conceive of Lady Clara Vere de Vere in a bath of perspiration? A Radical, on the other hand, is always perspiring. He is ever, axe in hand, cutting down the Upas Trees of ascendancy, or rooting up what he considers to be deeply-set abuses.'

But this is only a little matter out of a large book. It is a book of much miscellaneousness, which takes its title, *The Birth and Growth of Toleration*, from the first article in it (George Allen; 5s. net). It is a book of refreshing. Even the scolding is exhilarating and acceptable. It is so easy in a book, as in a sermon, to pass it on to some one else.

Who's Who.

The proper study of mankind is man, and the proper book for it is *Who's Who* (A. & C. Black; 10s. net). Everybody who is anybody is here, and their number is rapidly on the increase, so respectable is the world becoming. The volume for 1910 contains 2162 pages of double column and close type, which is just 50 pages more than the volume for 1909. The humorist will soon be suggesting that it is a mark of distinction not to be found in it. It has all sorts of uses. It tells us who is dead as well as who is alive. It enables us to distinguish one man from another. Here is Mr. Winston Churchill, the American author, and Mr. Winston Churchill, the President of the Board of Trade. Here is Mr. Frank Byron Jevons, Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall in Durham, and Mr. Shirley Byron Jevons, the Editor of the *Sportsman*. Here is Mr. Sidney Lee, the Editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and here is Mr. Sydney Lee, the painter. It tells us where everybody lives and what everybody does—or does not do, for one of the questions asked of everybody is 'What is your recreation?' And some deliberately declare that they have none.

Along with *Who's Who*, Messrs. A. & C. Black have issued the *Who's Who Year-Book* (1s. net). It is made up of such lists and tables as once appeared in *Who's Who*, from the list of the Royal Family at the beginning to the list of University Degrees and Hoods at the end. In the middle, and very wonderful, is the list of peculiarly pronounced proper names, names like Auchinleck and Pugh.

Then there is the *Writers and Artists' Year-Book* (1s. net), which is a directory for writers, artists, and photographers. It gives a list of British and American journals and magazines, literary agents, publishers, colour printers, and much more.

Last of all there is *The Englishwoman's Year-Book and Directory* (2s. 6d. net). This is the marvel of these marvels, both for cheapness and for efficiency. The information covers every part of the public life of women. And it is reliable, for it is written by experts. There is an article by Miss Anderson on Factory Inspectors, there is an article by Miss Moffatt on Research Work, and there is an article by Miss Frances Simpson on the keeping of Cats.

The Odes of Solomon.

The Psalms of Solomon we know something about, but what are the Odes of Solomon? In

certain lists of books which have come down to us mention is made of Odes of Solomon as well as of Psalms of Solomon as having a place amongst those writings which lie on the borderland of canonicity. Generally the reference is to a single book, in which, however, sometimes the Psalms and sometimes the Odes come first. The probability is that the Odes, like the Psalms, were written in Greek. But none of them have survived in that tongue. In Coptic, however, in the Gnostic book called *Pistis Sophia*, some fragments of them have been found. And now at last the discovery has been made of well-nigh the whole book of the Odes of Solomon in a Syriac manuscript in the possession of Dr. Rendel Harris.

The manuscript contains as usual both the Psalms and the Odes of Solomon. The version of the Psalms is itself interesting. But that interest is altogether eclipsed by the interest of the Odes. Dr. Rendel Harris has published a volume which contains the Syriac text both of the Odes and of the Psalms, a translation into English, a commentary and an introduction. Its title is *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, now first published from the Syriac Version* (Cambridge Press; 12s. net). It is a masterpiece of exposition. The learning is a credit to Cambridge and to the English speech. And over the learning is cast the light of a spiritual imagination which brings it at once into the service of religion.

The Psalms of Solomon were written in the first century B.C. They are little more than expansions of the canonical Hebrew Psalter, and they are of no great devotional value. The Odes were written, Dr. Rendel Harris believes, in the first century A.D. 'Their radiance,' says Dr. Rendel Harris, 'is no reflection from the illumination of other days: their inspiration is first-hand and immediate; it answers very well to the summary which Aristides made of the life of the Early Christian Church when he described them as indeed "a new people with whom something Divine is mingled."' Their value for devotion is very great. What place they may take in the future worship of the Church it would, of course, be folly to prophesy. But they will certainly take an important place in Christian edification.

Dr. Rendel Harris has not been content with producing an edition of the newly-discovered Odes of Solomon for scholars; he has also produced an edition for 'the "even Christian" of whom Shakespeare speaks—the man or woman "in the street" of the spiritual city, the people who know how to sing, better than they understand how to translate an Eastern language or comment upon an ancient book.' The title of the popular edition is *An Early Christian Psalter* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net).

And if the light of the imagination is thrown upon the scholarship of the scholar's edition, making it also a book fit for the uses of devotion, that scholarship pervades this book, doubling its worth for worship. For Dr. Rendel Harris is not the man to encourage the notion that the heart can be separated from the head in the service of the sanctuary or in the individual Christian life. There is not a line in this beautiful book over which the wayfaring man need even hesitate. Yet there is not a line that is not the outcome of the severest and most self-denying criticism. We quote Ode 13 because it is the shortest of them all.

'Behold! the Lord is our mirror: open the eyes and see them in Him: and learn the manner of your face: and tell forth praises to His spirit: and wipe off the filth from your face: and love His holiness, and clothe yourselves therewith: and be without stain at all times before Him. Hallelujah.'

The Church in North Africa.

The Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, chose *Church Life and Thought in North Africa* in A.D. 200, as the subject of his thesis for the D.D. degree. The essay has now been published (Cambridge Press; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. Donaldson has studied his subject as though he were to write a two-volume octavo on it, but he has chosen to write this little book that the people as well as the scholar may know something accurate about Tertullian and his times. The chapter of most importance at present is that on the Rivals of Christianity. Its three sections on the Cult of Isis, the Cult of Mithra, and Cæsar Worship are cut like cameos. But the whole book is a masterpiece of workmanship.

A New Commentary.

It is quite easy to be original in the writing of a commentary. Every new-fledged German commentator is original. But it is not easy to be original and useful. Everything that is worth doing seems to have been already done.

Yet the Rev. Edward E. Anderson, M.A., has accomplished it. He has written a commentary on *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, which has been accepted by the new editors, Dr Whyte and Dr. Kelman, for Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'Handbooks' (2s. 6d.). Its originality is in its index. An Index to the Bible has often been attempted. What we want is an index to each book of the Bible. Mr. Anderson has written an Index to the First Book of the New Testament which we do not know how to improve upon, though it is a subject which we have had in mind for some time. We shall give a specimen of it.

But first of all, let us notice the thoroughly competent and practical character of the commentary itself. It is just the book for Bible teaching, just the book for the busy preacher. Now let us take the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN as a specimen of the Index.

KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, 3^2, App. Note B.—

Discovery of, 13^{44}.
Entrance into—
Conditions of, 5^{20}: through life-long strenuousness, 7^{13-14}: through doing God's will, 7^{21} 19^{17} 21^{28-32}: through understanding and reception of truth, $13^{19.31}$: through the spirit of a child, 18^3: through faith in Jesus as the Messiah, 11^{11}: through membership in His fellowship, 25^{12}: through the faithful use of life, 25^{14-30}: exclusion through indifference, 22^{1-10}: exclusion through irreverence, 22^{11-13}: entered by few, 22^{14}.
Gradation in, 5^{19} 11^{11} 19^{30} 20^{23}.
As present, 4^1 12^{28-29} 13^{24} 13^{47}.
As future, 5^3 6^{10} 13^{31-32} 16^{28}.
Nature of—
Social joy, 8^{11} 22^2 26^{29}: indiscriminate invitation, 13^{47-50} 22^{8-10}: requiring man's forgiveness of man, 18^{23}: a society, 16^{18}: eternal, 25^{34}.
Nearness of, 10^7 3^2 16^{27} 4^{17}.
Nearness to, 11^{12-13} 11^{25}.
Power of, 13^{31-33}.
Spirit of, 5^{3-10} 5^{19} 11^{11} 18^3 19^{14}.
Value of, 13^{44-46}.

The New Testament in Modern Speech.

This is a third edition of Dr. Weymouth's *New Testament in Modern Speech* (Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). It is a much improved edition; for this book has an editor who is scarcely less enthusiastic than its author. So thoroughly has Mr. Hampden-Cook revised it that the whole volume has had to be re-set.

The Arts and Crafts of Egypt.

Professor Flinders Petrie is so enthusiastic and so dauntless that he becomes responsible for undertakings from which other men shrink, and carries them through successfully. This is true not only of his spade work, but also of the work of his pen. His latest enterprise is to write a history of *The Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt* (Foulis; 5s. net). It is as difficult as anything he has ever undertaken. The material is plentiful enough; the difficulty is in determining the place and the purpose of the various items, and of so separating out the relevant and rejecting the rest as to make anything that can justly be called a history possible. Yet Professor Flinders Petrie has accomplished it. He has covered the whole ground in a narrative that may be depended on for scientific accuracy, and yet may be comfortably read with only the smallest amount of scientific knowledge. The volume is not large, but extremely handsome. It is illustrated by 140 choice photographs.

The book would not be Flinders Petrie's if there were no bold generalizations in it, no theories to provoke thought. In the very introduction he dares a definition of art. He chooses Tolstoy's definition, that art is a means of communicating emotion, and defends it unreservedly. He says: 'It may be the emotion produced by beauty or by loathsomeness; each expression is equally art, though each is not equally desirable art. The emotion may be imparted by words, by forms, by sounds; all are equally vehicles of different kinds of art. But without imparting an emotional perception to the mind there is no art. The emotion may be the highest, that of apprehending character, and the innate meaning of mind and of Nature; or it may be the lower form of sharing in the transient interests and excitements of others; or the basest form of all, that of enjoying their evil.'

A New Bible.

Its title is *The Companion Bible*, and it is published by Mr. Henry Frowde of the Oxford University Press. No editor's name is attached to it. That indeed, we are told, is deliberately omitted; so that the whole burden of honour or dishonour rests upon the shoulders of the publisher. It is to appear in four parts. Part I., containing the Pentateuch, has appeared (4s. net). The page is divided into two columns. In one column is

the Authorized Version, printed in a good readable type. The other column is occupied with notes in smaller type. Sometimes the one column runs over into the other, according to the number of notes. At the end of the volume there is an appendix of seventy-five pages, containing a list of figures of speech, the spiritual significance of the names of the stars, a discussion of the serpent of Gn 3, and many other topics, concluding with an elaborate series of chronological charts.

What, then, is the attitude of the book, and what is it worth? Its attitude is frankly but not fiercely conservative. That is to say, it is just as conservative as it could be; but its conservatism is simply set down as indisputable fact. There is no space wasted in fighting the radicals. For example, the first sentence of the Appendix on the Serpent is this: 'In Genesis 3 we have neither allegory, myth, legend, nor fable, but literal historical facts set forth, and emphasized by the use of certain figures of speech.' Again, part of the curse on the Serpent is, 'Dust shalt thou eat'; on which we read, 'This is not true to the letter or to fact, but it is all the more *true to truth*.' It is a figure of speech similar to 'His enemies shall lick the dust' (Ps 72^9), which means that 'they will not do it on their knees with their literal tongues; but they will be so prostrated and so utterly defeated, that no words could literally depict their overthrow and subjugation.'

The risk which the commentator runs who is uncompromisingly conservative is to compromise at all hazards, and this commentator, whoever he is, has not escaped the hazard. This is the comment on 'And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head,' in Gn 47^{31}, 'Much confusion caused by supposing He 11^{21} refers to this. Mistake made by Ancient Versions and modern commentators. He 11^{21} refers to his blessing of Joseph's sons. This refers to the charge concerning his burial. It may or may not be bed, or staff.'

The Art of Life.

Under a general title like the 'Art of Life' an editor may bring anything that he pleases. The editor of this series, Mr. Edward Howard Griggs, has brought (1) *The Use of the Margin*, by himself; (2) *Where Knowledge Fails*, by Earl Barnes; (3) *Things Worth While*, by Thomas Wentworth Higginson; and (4) *Self-Measurement*, by William De Witt Hyde (Gay & Hancock; 1s. net each).

The Apostolic Age.

Germany is being overrun at present with theological Volksbücher. They are not all suitable for translation. Some of them would not stand it. But Mr. Philip Green has chosen wisely in getting a translation made of *The Apostolic Age*, by Professor von Dobschütz of Strassburg (2s. net).

Little Books on Religion.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have resolved to extend their series of little books, and have issued an interpretation of Newman's *Lead Kindly Light*, by Dr. John Sheridan Zelie, entitled *The Book of the Kindly Light*, as well as three essays on *The Literal Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount*, by Dr. Dods, Dr. Denney, and Dr. Moffatt. The essays were originally contributed to the *British Weekly*. In the same series appear *St. John's Portrait of Christ*, by the late Dr. George Matheson, and a captivating selection of sermons by Dr. James Moffatt on *The Second Things of Life* (1s. net each).

The Expositor.

In the new volume of the *Expositor* the editor has provided a greater variety of articles and a greater number of authors than we have seen for many a day. The only continued series are Dr. Garvie's 'Studies in the Pauline Theology,' Dr. Moulton and Dr. Milligan's 'Lexical Notes from the Papyri,' and Professor Stalker's 'Studies in Conversion.' If we are not mistaken, this number is also more expository than usual (Seventh Series, vol. vii. Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net).

Faith's Certainties.

The Rev. R. J. Drummond, D.D., is a great popular preacher in Edinburgh. He has moments of daring. Instead of falling back upon an accidental text, as most preachers do helplessly, he undertakes a series of subjects, and carries a course of sermons right through a winter's preaching. First he chose *Faith's Perplexities*, and then he chose *Faith's Certainties*. The latter course he has just published (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

He has his moments of daring, we say, but he never dares or desires to be other than a common man among common men. He is no mystic. The things he preaches are attainable things. But he is altogether loyal; they are things attainable only in Christ.

'The Century Bible.'

The new volume is *Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther*, by Professor T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D., D.D., of Bangor (Jack; 2s. 6d. net). In the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges,' Ezra and Nehemiah are edited by Bishop Ryle, and Esther by Dr. Streane. And Professor Witton Davies has had much to do in steering clear of these books. He is not a copyist. His difficulty has been not a moral, but a mechanical one. It has been how to say on the same passages for the same people and within the same space what has been well said already and say it differently. Occasionally he is more, sometimes he is less, explicit. 'Great stones,' he says (on Ezra 5^8), are lit. 'Stones of rolling,' *i.e.* stones too large to be carried, and having therefore to be *rolled*. Ryle calls them 'stones that are too large for ordinary transport and requiring to be *moved on rollers*.' The meaning is the same, but Dr. Witton Davies is liable to be misunderstood.

Reality.

In the year 1893 Mr. E. D. Fawcett published his *Riddle*, and Professor William James read it with 'enormous satisfaction.' But, in spite of this encouragement, Mr. Fawcett wants his *Riddle* to be forgotten, and he has written another book, *The Individual and Reality* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net), in order to supersede it. Mr. Fawcett is determined to go straight to Reality in the search for truth. And to that end he has separated himself from every form of Faith and every school of philosophy.

But where is he to find Reality? In appearances, he says. The object of philosophical thinking is truth, and the branch of philosophy called Metaphysics strives after its particular kind of truth, which is truth about the general nature or meaning of Appearance. But does not Mr. Bradley say that 'Metaphysics is an attempt to know Reality as against mere appearances'? Perhaps Mr. Bradley and Mr. Fawcett are using the word 'appearance' with different meanings. Mr. Fawcett uses the word 'appearances' simply in place of what he calls 'the ugly word phenomena.' To him there is no such thing as 'mere appearance.' Appearances that are not real are mythical.

Well, what does a man come to believe who starts out without faith and without philosophy, to discover Reality in appearances? What does he find out about himself, about nature, about God? Take the last alone. What does he find out about God? He finds out that there is none. At least if there is a God, you can never say that there is. There may be, and there may not be. 'God, as we have deduced him, remains hypothetical.' Mr. Fawcett reaches this conclusion by cutting away from God everything that would make Him God-like. Thus he cuts away omniscience; and this is the way he does it.

'Omniscience would be a most questionable excellence. Past and present sentient experience contains much which no divine being would treasure for aye. Very much of it is not worth preservation, even in idea. Are the squalid details of animal life on this planet, the agonies of a *Jardin des Supplices*, the abominations of decay and disease, etc., all indelibly present to God? Are they eternally secure phases of an experience which desires the best? Or is God, like us, able to prefer and select? He is impossibly omniscient. But would not perfect memory even of a limited past be a burden quite too intolerable to be borne?

'God may well strive to thrust into the subconscious innumerable appearances which mar his life. Instead of desiring to know everything, he may desire to forget very much. If the betterment of his being demands it, he may have to suppress memories on a great scale. The rejected of God sinks back into the abyss of the Ground.'

Watson of Largs.

It is not a biography; it is only a biographical note of ten pages, prefixed to a new edition of Dr. Watson's exposition of the *First Epistle General of St. John* (Maclehose; 4s. 6d. net). The exposition had a great reception when it was first published, its scholarship was so good, its fidelity to the mind of Christ in the Epistle so close. The new edition will be a surprise to a new generation. But the man was better than his book. 'To one who was hesitating and doubtful whether he should not take another year either in Germany or at home, before beginning ministerial work, Dr. Dods said "Go to Largs; it will be equal to another course to be with Dr. Watson."'

The Philosophy of Change.

'There are men who realise so clearly the area of uncertainty that surrounds all knowledge, who

feel so acutely that of what they know best there is still so much more to be known, that they cannot assert anything save with reservations. Of such was the great English Bishop who, when a pupil gratefully acknowledged his explanation of some knotty point with a downright "Thank you, sir. You have made that perfectly clear," is said to have answered, "Oh! I hope not. I hope not."'

The anecdote is taken from Mr. Lilley's new book. It applies to the author of a volume entitled *The Philosophy of Change* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). It applies with tenfold emphasis. For Mr. D. P. Rhodes does not believe that there is any knowledge possible of anything; he does not believe that there is anything to have knowledge of. 'The purpose of this book,' he says himself, 'is to show that truth has never been, and cannot now be, demonstrated by man as a whole or in any part.'

Other anecdotes might be applied to him. Again he says of himself, 'My language at times becomes colloquial. This is emphatically a serious work, and dignity or gravity of attitude has no place in the execution of it.'

What, then, is the book about? It is written to establish the following proposition: 'Any doctrine of a final cause is not merely unsatisfactory by reason of its incompleteness, but also untenable even provisionally, since the cause, to exist as such, could have no contact with our universe unless it were identified with it and so ceased to be a cause.'

Very Far East.

We have no right to say that there never was a pleasanter book written by a missionary than this book, called *Very Far East* (Marshall Brothers), which has been written by Mrs. Lechmere Clift, wife of Dr. Clift of the Emmanuel Medical Mission at Nanning in South China. But we are entitled to say that we never read a pleasanter or a better. It is difficult to say what gives it its attractiveness. The letters, for it is simply a bundle of letters, are written by a real letter-writer and without a thought of publication. Perhaps the secret lies there. Let us put in our thumb and pull out a plum here and there.

'Chinese people must have time to get used to a new idea. The motto of China is "Marn, marn Hang"—"Slowly, slowly go," and I think I am beginning to learn that you cannot and must not hurry a Chinese! You only regret it afterwards!'

'We stood round the grave and sang again—"Peace, Perfect Peace." "It is very strange," said some of the heathen when they heard of it; "we go and wail at the graves of our friends, *you* stand round and *sing*!"'

'Not far from this house is a high hill with a sort of cave in it, and in the cave is a quaint little idol—a baby carved out of stone, lying on its back. It is the baby's idol, and when a little one has an ache or pain anywhere in its tiny body, the mother will climb up the hill, and rub the corresponding part of the stone baby's body. You will not be surprised to hear that that stone baby's little stomach is quite smooth and shining, through all the many, many mothers' hands which have rubbed it because their babies were suffering from dyspepsia! And you would not be surprised that many babies got indigestion if you saw all the dreadful things they are allowed to eat!'

'Yesterday he came to Mr. Child with a lot of questions on Genesis—"If Eve was made from Adam's rib, Adam must have had one less. How is it that we men have not got one less than the women? What a pity it isn't so, because then everybody would know that Genesis is quite true!"'

'"Oh! Seni, it is *hard* to bring up children in China," burst forth the impetuous little woman. "I think I should tell you. Some of the little, little children in the compound talk of such vile things to one another that I can't even repeat what they say. Babies! only so high! They say——" she flushed and drew back. "No, even I do not dare to repeat to you. It's horrible, horrible! Do you wonder," her eyes flashed, "that I keep my little twins always in the house?"'

The Essential Episcopate.

Mr. John Murray has this month published a new book by the Bishop of Birmingham, and he has also republished Dr. Gore's *Bampton Lectures* (2s. 6d. net). The new book, first delivered as lectures in the Cathedral, is an apologetic for Episcopacy. Dr. Gore has reconsidered the whole subject, and he is more assured than ever that 'the episcopate is an essential constituent of Christianity.' He calls the book *Orders and Unity* (3s. 6d. net). *Orders* alone might have done for the title, but Unity is at the bottom of the argument. Well, Presbyterians and Congre-

gationalists will receive with respect anything that comes from the Bishop of Birmingham, and will read it. But they will not be converted by this book. For it is not a matter of argument, but of attitude. They do not come to the same conclusion, not because they do not follow the same rules of reasoning, but because they do not begin with the same axioms. They do not agree upon the meaning of the words, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh.' And these words are fundamental.

Folklore of the Santal Parganas.

The Santal Parganas is a district 4800 square miles in area, lying about 150 miles north of Calcutta. The Santals at present form about one-third of the population.

The Santals are a Munda tribe, a branch of that aboriginal element which probably entered India from the north-east. Their religion is animistic. Spirits are everywhere around them: the spirits of their ancestors, the spirit of the house, the spirit dwelling in the patch of primeval forest preserved in each village; every hill, tree, and rock may have its spirit. These spirits are propitiated by elaborate ceremonies and sacrifices, which generally terminate in dances and the drinking of rice beer.

The Rev. Dr. Campbell, of the United Free Church Mission to the Santals, published a collection of Santal Folk Tales in 1891. These he gathered in the district of Manbhum. The Rev. Dr. O. Bodding, of the Scandinavian Mission, has gathered a large number in the Santal Parganas. These have been translated by Mr. Cecil Henry Bompas, I.C.S., and the translation is now issued under the title of *Folklore of the Santal Parganas* (David Nutt). Mr. Bompas has classified the stories into six parts, three of the six being stories relating to animals, stories relating to spirits, and illustrations of the belief in witchcraft.

The stories make delightful reading. And there is much instruction mingled with the delight. One must serve as illustration of all the rest.

The Brahman's Clothes.

There was once a Brahman who had two wives; like many Brahmans he lived by begging, and was very clever at wheedling money out of people. One day the fancy took him to go to the market-place dressed only in a small loin cloth such as the poorest labourers wear, and see how people treated him. So he set out, but on the road and in the market-place and in the village no one salaamed to him, or made way to him, and when he begged no one gave him alms. He soon got tired of this, and hastened home, and putting on his best *pagri* and coat and dhoti went back to the market-place. This time every one who met him on the road salaamed low to him and made way for him, and every shopkeeper to whom he went gave him alms: and the people in the village who had refused before gladly made offerings to him. The Brahman went home smiling to himself, and took off his clothes and put them in a heap, and prostrated himself before them three or four times, saying each time, 'O source of wealth: O source of wealth! it is clothes that are honoured in this world and nothing else.'

Music.

If theory is of little use without practice, practice is worse than useless without theory. Therefore the new volume of the 'International Scientific Series,' which gives the whole theory of music, and which is thoroughly scientific, well written and well translated, is of widespread and inestimable value. Its title is *Music: Its Laws and Evolution*, the author being Professor Jules Combarieu of the Collège de France (Kegan Paul; 5s.).

But what is music? 'Music,' says Professor Combarieu, 'is the art of thinking in sounds. If this be not granted,' he argues, 'it will be impossible to understand a quartet of Beethoven, or any other musical composition; a phrase can no longer be distinguished from a simple, regular sequence of sounds; it cannot be explained in what way *Au clair de la lune* differs from an adagio of one of the great masters. Our definition embraces all the facts, and sacrifices none. The composer of music-hall waltzes is a man who thinks in sounds as does a Bach or a Handel, only his thought is weak, superficial, trivial, poor, and as far from that of Handel or Bach as that of an ordinary writer differs from the thought of a Leibnitz, a Pascal, or a Bossuet. The Hottentot, who has only three or four notes in his melodies, also thinks in sounds, only his thought is (from our point of view) blurred, incomplete, and barbarous.'

Buddhism.

Dr. H. Hackmann has almost accomplished the impossible. The impossible is for one man to give a complete account of Buddhism. In the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, as we are

informed in the second volume recently published, Buddhism will be handled in a series of articles, each article describing the Buddhism of a particular country, and written by one who knows it as practised in that country. For one man to describe the religion as practised everywhere is either to commit many mistakes or to be content with a colourless compendium. Dr. Hackmann has a real knowledge of the subject; and he has worked his book on right lines, giving first of all an account of Buddha himself, then sketching the development of the doctrine, and last of all describing the Buddhism of each country separately. To do this he has, of course, been dependent on literature. But he knows the literature, and he knows the subject well enough to know how to use the literature. On the whole we reckon it just as good a manual as could have been produced by one man, and heartily recommend the book as an introduction to a most fascinating subject. The title is *Buddhism as a Religion* (Probsthain; 6s. net).

The Manual for the Sick.

When Canon Brightman prepared his translation of the *Preces Privatæ* of Bishop Andrewes, he intended to include *The Manual for the Sick* in the same volume with it. But the Manual had to be omitted to keep down the bulk, and now it is issued separately (Rivingtons; 3s. 6d. net). It is better so. It could by no stretch have been called a Manual if it had been bound up with the *Preces*.

Contemporary Quotation.

Of what use are Dictionaries of Quotation? Who uses them, and for what purpose? The making of them must be delightful. One has the pleasure of reading poetry along with a sense, however vague, that there is profit in the reading. But who uses them when they are made? Is it the journalist, conscious that his leader is not very literary? Or is it the preacher, ballasting earnestness with elegance?

Whoever uses them, they are used. Messrs. Sonnenschein have quite a library of them, and some of the volumes have run up into many editions. Here is a new and cheap edition of Helena Swan's *Dictionary of Contemporary Quotations* (*English*) (3s. 6d. net).

Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

By the Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., Wimbledon.

3. Of Boldness of Speech.

ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην ἐλπίδα πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα (2 Co 3^{12}).

In a discussion of the 'good degree' (1 Ti 3^{13}), we noted that a further achievement of a nobly-fulfilled diaconate was 'much boldness (παρρησίαν) in the faith which is in Christ.' The word is not less interesting because it is by no means an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, but a very familiar term in the Apostle's vocabulary and indeed in the New Testament generally. The deacon learns the value of a joyous fearlessness of utterance in matters of 'the faith,' the faith which lives, and moves, and has its being 'in Christ.' Even more striking is the passage above quoted, where the Apostle is contrasting the old order and the new, the old with its ritual which kept God at an awful distance and veiled His glory, and the new with its ἐλευθερία, its freedom of action and access and movement for the soul. 'Where the spirit of the Lord is,' cries the enthusiastic Apostle in memorable words, 'there is liberty' (ἐλευθερία). And ἐλευθερία is the atmosphere in which παρρησία blossoms like a white rose of the garden amid the pure airs of the countryside. Neither word, indeed, is specifically Biblical. Plato, in the *Republic* (557B), brings the two together in his discussion of a democracy: 'Does not liberty of act and speech abound in the city?' (ἐλευθερίας ἡ πόλις μεστὴ καὶ παρρησίας). But there is a peculiar beauty and power in the words when brought into relation with the *civitas Dei*.

Παρρησία is a term which Christianity has

borrowed from classical Greek only to invest it with a new and more glorious meaning. Indignation might drive a Juvenal into verse; but it is a full heart, conscious of the richness and transforming energies of a new evangel, that moves the Christian to frankness of speech. We use great 'plainness of speech' is the familiar and delightful A.V. rendering. The Vulgate is here somewhat colourless, and gives us *fiducia* as its rendering. This is a case which illustrates the truth of the late Bishop Westcott's saying, 'Latin is all angles: but Greek has no angles at all.' And he went on to quote *Verbum caro factum est*, protesting against the inadequacy of subject and verb. *Fiducia* hardly conveys the idea of boldness of *speech*. The fact is, Latin cannot give us an equivalent for the term. The παρρησία of Peter and John (Ac 4^{13}) is wrongly translated *constantia* (Vulg.); for what the priests and elders marvelled at was not so much the courage of Peter and John, but the fine boldness of their oratory, the surprising eloquence of ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται. This, however, is what the first enthusiasm for the gospel produced. One of the gifts of God enumerated by Clement (i. 35^{2}) is 'truth with boldness' (ἀλήθεια ἐν παρρησίᾳ), truth openly and plainly declared, without economy or obscurity; similarly, in the epistle to Diognetus xi. 2, we have the expression παρρησίᾳ λαλῶν indicating the clearness and intelligibility of the gospel. But the Apostolic Fathers do not use the word so freely as the New Testament writers. Sometimes we ask ourselves whether the New Testament writers mean to express by the word the candour which leaves nothing obscure or unintelligible; or the boldness which utters the truth and the whole truth: probably both ideas are conveyed in the word, and the exact *nuance* has to be caught from the context. Παρρησίᾳ certainly is contrasted in Jn 16^{25} with ἐν παροιμίαις, and means there, as in Jn 10^{24}, 'clearly' and 'unambiguously,' *ohne Umschweife*, as Preuschen puts it (*Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T.*, p. 878). But in St. Paul's Epistles we get passage after passage, like Eph 6^{19} (ἐν παρρησίᾳ γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου), where the word undoubtedly indicates that right of free speech which, as Lightfoot remarks (see note on Ph 1^{20}), is the badge, the privilege of the servant of Christ.

We may note in passing that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (cf. 3^{6} 4^{16} 10^{19} 10^{35}) appears to broaden out the meaning, as when he says, 'having therefore *boldness* to enter into the holy place,' and, 'let us draw near with *boldness* to the throne of grace'; but it may be doubted even in such passages whether παρρησία really loses its connotation of speech or the utterance of words. Freedom of access to God goes along with freedom of speech: both are gifts of 'the better covenant.'

With these facts before us, it may be relevant to ask the question, is παρρησία a characteristic of modern religious life? Both our Lord and His Apostles place a remarkable emphasis on our powers of speech and conversation, not only because of the temptations and perils that beset us in this form of self-manifestation, but mainly because they knew that the language of the lips was an all-important element in the Christian service. 'By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.' We publish ourselves not only in our set utterances, but in the casual table-talk and conversation of our daily lives. For the most part we avoid direct allusions to religion, its vital experiences and claims. Often this is due to a healthy hatred of unreality and cant, often to a feeling that reticence best befits matters of sacred import and all intimate concerns of the soul. But there is a grave danger lest we should go too far in this cultivation of silence, and lose that gift of buoyant and natural testimony which entered so largely into the early life of Christianity. Christianity had nothing to conceal, though her enemies made much of her secret *sodalicia* and strange rites. 'Come and see' was always her invitation to the questioning mind. The *disciplina arcani* is alien to her spirit, and Tertullian was a mistaken exponent of the religion which he sought to defend, when he stated that Christians could not on evidence reveal the mystery of the Lord's Supper.[1] 'The truth as it is in Jesus' was spread by the testifying powers of the 'saints,' servants of Christ who indeed were far from perfect but were yet conscious of the mighty change He had wrought in them. Commenting recently on the lives of the early Methodist preachers, Professor A. Caldecott[2] made the following statement: 'Religion is for the race and not for the individual soul (only): the flow of spiritual grace seems impossible where the habit of reticence prevails. I cannot but ascribe the wide range of Methodism

[1] See Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, i. 188.

[2] See *The Religious Sentiment*, by Rev. A. Caldecott, p. 4.

in the Christendom of to-day to its conviction that the bearing of testimony to the realities of the spiritual life is perfectly natural in itself, and a means by which the Holy Spirit extends His grace from soul to soul.' It is not every one that has the authentic gift of testifying; but how few professing Christians ever realize that the practice of παρρησία is too easily neglected? The power is latent in every true Christian heart, though for reasons of temperament, natural shyness and diffidence, it may never come to development. There are Christian men and women who (to quote Dr. A. Maclaren) 'can talk animatedly and interestingly of anything but of their Saviour and His Kingdom.' Why? Because their hearts are not full. 'The real reason for the unbroken silence in which many Christian people conceal their faith is mainly the small quantity of it which there is to conceal.' Undoubtedly, the secret of the Apostolic παρρησία lay in the fact that they were men full of their subject: the tongue became eloquent because the springs of their being had been reinforced by a new Divine energy. They were emancipated too: 'delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God'; and their first instinct was to declare their joy. As Charles Wesley puts it in one of his hymns:

> What we have felt and seen,
> With confidence we tell
> And publish to the sons of men
> The signs infallible.

And similar outpourings of souls, 'disburdened of their load,' find expression in the characteristic hymns of Methodism.

Another element in the παρρησία of the Apostles, especially of St. Paul, was the passion for the souls of men. They spoke the ἔπεα πτερόεντα of conviction, of warning, of persuasion, of strong faith and fiery love, because they felt the infinite peril of the ignorance, darkness, and degradation of the society in which they moved 'as luminaries, holding forth the word of life.' Their one desire was so to speak as to arouse in the hearts of their hearers a sense of sin, and to give them thus awakened a vision of Christ.

> Oh, could I tell, ye surely would believe it!
> Oh, could I only say what I have seen!
> How should I tell or how can ye receive it,
> How, till he bringeth you where I have been?
>
> Therefore, O Lord, I will not fail nor falter,
> Nay, but I ask it, nay, but I desire,
> Lay on my lips thine embers of the altar,
> Seal with the sting and furnish with the fire.
>
> (Myers' *St. Paul.*)

It is perhaps the thought of a fruitful service of witness-bearing, free from the taint of self-seeking, which inspires St. John, in one of the two passages of the Epistles (1 Jn 2^{28}; cf. 1 Jn 3^{21}) where he uses παρρησία, to say, 'And now, my little children, abide in him: that if he shall be manifested we may have *boldness*, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.' If we are to carry our free unreserved utterance over into eternity, even into the Presence of the Judge and not shrink from Him 'like guilty things ashamed,' it will be on account of the brave witnessing for the truth to which both the Giver and the Gift of the gospel inspires every single-minded and self-effacing servant of Christ.

Entre Nous.

THE SECOND VOLUME.

Professor W. L. Davidson.

I hasten to congratulate you most heartily on Vol. II. of The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. There is no falling off here; and, indeed, in some respects, this volume is superior to its predecessor, if that were possible. The book is magnificent, and is going to occupy a unique position; and you deserve the highest praise as as well as the sincerest gratitude.

Dr. Rendel Harris.

This new volume of Religion and Ethics is splendid. Schrader on the Aryan Religion is worth all the money. If the series evolves like this, it will be the best thing of the kind ever produced in England.

Dr. J. P. Lilley.

May I add that Vol. II. is certain to commend the Dictionary to a very wide circle.

Professor Nestle.

The excellent article by Professor von Dobschütz on the BIBLE IN THE CHURCH in the new volume of the *E.R.E.* contains one slight mistake. Under 'Titles and Citations' he says: '*τὰ βίβλια* is the favourite expression in Chrysostom.' May I refer to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xv. 566, where it is shown that *βιβλία* and *τὰ βιβλία* with Chrysostom only mean 'books,' not the 'Bible.' The origin and oldest history of the word 'Bible' is still an unsolved riddle.

I ask both author and editor to see in this reference a token of admiration, not of criticism.

The Aberdeen Free Press.

It is worthy to be compared with any Encyclopædia ever offered to the public. It is our fortune to use many Encyclopædias in English, French, and German; and we do not know one that covers the same field, or one which has contents of a higher order, or of more thorough workmanship.

The Methodist Recorder.

Probably the climax of interest is reached in the article BIBLE, which has been entrusted to Dr. Sanday, though a supplementary article, BIBLE IN THE CHURCH, of more than twice the length, has been contributed by Professor von Dobschütz, of Strassburg, and the two need to be studied together. Dr. Sanday discusses the history of the Old and New Testaments, and the formation of the Canon in each case, whilst Dr. von Dobschütz deals with the Origin, Spread, and Authority of the Bible, with Bible studies and the Bible in Divine Service, in private use and in the life of the people. It would be invidious to compare the two articles; each is excellent in its way. Dr. Sanday's wise and discriminate handling of the critical subject of the Canon should be specially noted, whilst the amount of varied information, skilfully arranged, which is presented in the second article, can, as far as we know, be found nowhere else—at least, in compact and available form.

We heartily congratulate Dr. Hastings on the prompt appearance of so excellent a second volume of this monumental work, and we would urge librarians and readers of all types to avail themselves of the simply incalculable advantages furnished by the Dictionary of Religion and Ethics thus in progress of publication.

The Scotsman.

Within its limits it is quite equal to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* at its best, and the whole undertaking is a credit to its Edinburgh publisher, and indeed to Scotland.

As the result of an examination which has been both extensive and minute, the promoters of the Encyclopædia may be heartily congratulated on the high level of excellence which the work reaches all through, and if it be maintained in the volumes yet to come there is no doubt that the publication will speedily become an indispensable adjunct to the libraries of all serious students of its subjects.

The Jewish Chronicle.

The second volume of Dr. James Hastings's Encyclopædia more than equals the first in excellence. No editor has ever succeeded in gathering so splendid an army of experts. Many of the articles are by the best living authorities, and as, by the nature of the case, new ground is often broken, it is a great boon that the pioneer work has been done by men so capable and trustworthy. The favourable impression created by the first volume is thus confirmed and deepened by the second.

STUDIES IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Dr. A. M. Fairbairn dedicates his new book to 'the Old Mansfield Men.' But we are all old Mansfield men. He himself has made us so. For what have they received that he has not sooner or later given to us in preached sermon, printed pamphlet, or published volume? The new volume is a consistent, as well as a persistent, plea for toleration, a plea for the inclusive conception of the Church of God, and the dedication does not contradict its catholicity.

The title is *Studies in Religion and Theology* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net). There is also a sub-title, 'The Church: In Idea and in History.' That sub-title is a nearer definition. It really embraces all that the book contains. It covers all that Dr. Fairbairn has ever been interested in. And it may here be said at once that no man in our time has worked harder on behalf of the idea and the history of the Church. What he has accomplished it may never be possible to estimate. It is certainly not possible yet. But in estimating the accomplishment we must not forget to take

into account and consider what he may have prevented of a wrong ideal of the Church, and a wrong reading of its history.

The book is therefore less miscellaneous than it seems to be. It is only on a superficial glance at its contents that it is miscellaneous. The word 'Church,' battered as it has been, is the key which opens every article that the book contains, even every page of every article. And yet it is quite possible for those to whom it has not been given to battle for the Church as it has been given to Dr. Fairbairn, to read page after page—as of the exposition of the Sermon on the Mount—without once allowing the idea of the Church to enter. Let us quote one such paragraph.

> The worship of Mammon is thus as possible to the poor man as to the rich, to the workman as to the millionaire, to the son of industry as to the child of luxury; it is but to live as if there were no God, while by lip and by speech we profess to think He is. The forms it may assume are infinite. A late distinguished continental scholar once said to me: 'The most characteristic words in a language are those no term in any other language can translate, for they are the words that express the ideas most distinctive of the people who speak the language. Now the most characteristic word of your English tongue and people, without an equivalent in any tongue I know, is *comfort*. The idea and the term you alone possess.' In that saying there was humiliation as well as instruction; the names for our higher ideas, 'God,' 'the soul,' 'freedom,' 'immortality,' can be translated; but no term in any tongue can translate a term so steeped in the new type of Materialism as 'comfort.' Yet our most characteristic ideas are those we most love. Suppose, then, we use the word here and simply say, 'Ye cannot serve God and comfort,' would the saying be false, and could it be said to express the mind of Jesus? The man who worships 'comfort' worships care; the more servants wait upon him the greater the number of anxieties that come thronging in their train. And it paralyses the soul and numbs its very feeling for higher things. Let us think of the woman who has soft carpets under her feet, maids to anticipate her every want and take out of her hands the labours of the day and relieve her brain from all effort at thought. She lies on her sofa and reads the last new novel, shedding bitter tears over the imaginary sorrows of the heroine, yet they are sorrows she is too indolent to imagine for herself and must have imagined for her, and relate to some forsaken girl or some wronged and disappointed man. Below in her own kitchen, or in the slums whose gaunt outlines lie in the shadow of her stately mansion, darker and more gruesome dramas are daily enacted and tragedies performed by men and women of real flesh and blood. Her very comfort has made her selfish, and turned into veritable darkness the light that ought to have burned bright within her! There is nothing that so increases sorrow as the comfort that comes without labour, the wealth that knows no duty, and the selfish ease which has no need save that of being ministered unto. But God is duty, and duty is God. And so the woman who is so active in the ministries of common life as to have no time to waste on imaginary sorrows has a strength and a joy that her idler and softer sister can never know. The unity in thought and feeling which Jesus pleads for means the beatitude of the dutiful, who have forsaken the service of Mammon for the richer service of God.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. Walter Owen, Baptist Church, Penzance, to whom a copy of Law's *Tests of Life* has been sent, and the Rev. Robert Whyte, B.D., United Free Church, Portobello, to whom a copy of Newton Clarke's *Doctrine of God* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for March must be received by the 1st of February. The text is Rev 21^{1}.

The Great Text for April is Rev 21^{5}—'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Holborn's *Architectures of European Religions*, or Geden's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for May is Rev 21^{27}—'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, or of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev $22^{3.4}$—'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev. 22^{14}—'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates unto the city.' A copy of Walker's *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister and his Duties*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. Percy Gardner is Fellow of Lincoln College and Professor of Classical Archæology in the University of Oxford. The special department in which he is an authority is the religion of Greece. But he has studied the origins of Christianity. He has an acquaintance with theology, both historical and dogmatic, which would do credit to a professional theologian. He can write literary English. And he is a man of a most attractive spirit.

Professor Gardner has just published an address on Christian Faith. It is evidence of his interest in religion that he should have chosen Faith as the subject of his address when invited to speak to the Martineau Society in 1909. It is evidence of his interest in the Christian religion that he should have called his address 'The Essential Nature of Christian Faith.' And it is evidence, further, of his sense of having something to say about Christian Faith that he publishes that address in a volume which, from the title of the first address in it, he has called *Modernity and the Churches* (Williams & Norgate; 5s.).

He divides his address on Christian Faith into three 'heads,' as though he were a preacher of the last generation. But he is not a preacher. With all his interest in theology, he is careful to observe the distance that separates the man to whom theology is the business of life, from the man to whom it is a pastime. Nor is he of the last generation. In the first address here he speaks about those who are called 'modernists,' but there is not one of the modernists who is more modern than himself.

He divides his address into three 'heads' because he finds it convenient to speak of Faith, Religious Faith, and Christian Faith separately. And to make the comparison with the preacher complete he clears the way to his 'heads' by an introduction. Faith, he says in the introduction, is not merely an intellectual thing, such as the assent to a proposition or a creed. Nor is it merely an emotional thing, such as loyalty to a recognized spiritual authority, 'the view current in the Broad Church.' Thus he clears the way.

Then to the first head. But stay. Is the way quite clear? Are we sure that faith is not 'assent to a proposition or a creed'? Are we sure that it is not 'loyalty of heart to a recognized spiritual authority'? Perhaps the caution is enough. Let us pass on.

The first head is the nature of faith in general. And on faith in general Professor Gardner says excellent things. It is not of the will only, he says, because the will has to do with action. It is of the spirit. For faith, though it is always an active quality, does not always produce action. Some-

times it becomes enthusiasm, 'an enthusiasm of the spirit.' That is the first thing. The second thing is its relation to experience. It rises out of experience; it goes beyond experience; it is subject to the control of experience.

But these are abstract statements, and, as Professor GARDNER says, it is not easy to convert abstract statements into the current coin of thought. So he gives examples. 'A child may know by experience that he can float in water, yet it requires a perceptible exercise of faith before he can throw himself into the water in the certain hope of rising to the top.' And he has a better example than that.

He has the example of trust. But is not trust faith? No, trust is not faith; it is the result of faith. Faith, says Professor GARDNER, is in its essence 'a self-determination, a putting of the whole being into an attitude of trust.' Faith puts the whole being into the attitude, trust is the result of that self-determination. The determination may be sudden, and the result immediate; or it may be slow, and the trust long in coming. A man determines to trust another man. The determination may be based on slowly gathered experience of the man's character. Or it may be due to an emotional impulse, to a sudden desire to love him, a sudden discovery, perhaps, that he must return the trust which the other man already has in him. And the trust that is emotional is better than the trust that is intellectual. 'Trust which, if it arose entirely out of stress of will, would be hard and cold, is the easiest and simplest thing possible when aroused by love.'

All this, we say, is excellent, and excellently expressed. We need not linger over it. The second head is Religious Faith.

Now the difference between Faith and Religious Faith is this. Religious Faith 'goes further into the realm of good and evil.' It goes as far as God. It is true, Dr. GARDNER does not use that word. He prefers to use the word Power. But as he uses Power with a capital, there seems to be little difference. Religious Faith then, in its essence, is the belief, a belief sustained by a continuous will to believe, that a beneficent and wise Power lies behind the visible world; that the working of the universe, if it could be understood, would be found to be essentially kind and good to man; that life is worth living; and that it is, in the long run, wise to do what it is our duty to do.

But is not that simply optimism? No, watch the phrase 'in the long run.' It seems parenthetical. It is essential. The mere optimist can say that on the whole Providence is good, and life is worth living. But suppose that a man lost his belief in Providence. Suppose that an experience came to him which seemed to say that Providence was either not good or not able to make His goodness appear. Then religious faith enables him to recover his belief. And if he dies before he recovers it, religious faith enables others to believe that he will recover it in a life to come.

We reach the third head. The third head is Christian Faith. And if the title is accurate, Christian Faith is the subject of the address. What, then, is Christian Faith?

Some of us in our simplicity would say that Christian Faith is faith in Christ. Professor GARDNER does not say so. When he spoke of Religious Faith he did not call it faith in God. When he speaks of Christian Faith he does not call it faith in Christ. He calls it faith in the history contained in the Gospels, faith in the Christian spirit, and faith in the Church.

He calls it faith in the history which the Gospels contain. There may not be much history. Criticism may have carried most of it away. But 'it is of the very nature of vigorous faith that it can build securely on a very narrow platform of historic fact.' It may be necessary that we should

be able to believe in 'the life of the Founder as one really lived on earth,' and that His character and teaching are 'in essentials' to be ascertained. But that is enough.

He calls it faith in the Christian spirit. If we are to have Christian Faith, he says, we must not only believe in at least some of the things recorded in the Gospels, but we must also believe that 'after the death of the Founder a fresh spirit entered into the world, a fresh power urging to righteousness and the spiritual life.' Where did that spirit come from? Professor GARDNER does not say. Did it come from Christ? He does not say, and he does not think it necessary to say. 'That there is some relation between the spirit of Christianity and the person of the Founder may be regarded as certain.' But what that relation was, and how the new spirit arose, does not matter. It arose; it is there; and we must believe in it.

But Christian Faith is also faith in the Church. Does Professor GARDNER believe, then, that the Church is infallible? By no means. Christian Faith 'does not oblige us to believe in the infallibility of the Church, or to hold that the path taken by the Church is always the best path.' It is Christian faith if a man believes in Christ's 'general guidance' of the Church.

The Rev. HOLDEN E. SAMPSON of Broad Town Vicarage, Swindon, has written a book on 'The Catholic Church, its Functions and Offices in the World, reviewed in the Light of the Ancient Mysteries and Modern Science.' He gives it the title of *Progressive Redemption* (Rebman; 12s. 6d. net). In a short preface he tells us how he came to write the book.

He found an irresistible force within him urging him to the severe task and labour of satisfying his own mental and spiritual demands for Truth. He calls his life a weary pilgrimage. He had to follow unknown paths. He met endless disillusionments and disappointments. He passed many years of a tempestuous lifetime, often dropping back into the currents of the world, and as often turning again to meet the opposing stream for another effort. His conduct, he thinks, might well have wearied and worn out the patience of his friends. The blind pursuit of an ever elusive light, which twinkled in the distance, but was apparently unreachable, was as much a mystery of destiny to himself as a perplexity to his neighbour. But a fate which he was powerless to control kept him doggedly on the path; till, finally, he reached the goal, and entered into the light. Then he wrote a book in two immense volumes, which he called *Progressive Creation*; and followed it up immediately with this book in one immense volume, which he calls *Progressive Redemption*.

It is a book about Mysteries and Initiation into them, about Transmutation, Equilibration, and Purification of the Natures. And there never was a book that a sympathetic reviewer found more difficulty in describing. As a poem is either a poem and very much indeed, or not a poem and nothing, so Mr. Sampson's book is either a work of the spiritual imagination and of priceless worth, or it is, as the speech of Gratiano, 'an infinite deal of nothing.'

The idea of Redemption is familiar. But what is Progressive Redemption? We have entered but a few pages into the book when we come upon the definition of a Redeemed man—a Redeemed man according to the doctrine of progressive redemption. A Redeemed man, 'if he is qualified to enter the Kingdom of Heaven free of Purgatorial suffering,' must have three qualifications. First, he must be 'a normal microcosm.' And being a normal microcosm means being 'perfect in his Nature-conditions, none of his natures or parts sundered in the reincarnate life.' Next, he must have conformed faithfully to the principles of the Cross and the Serpents, embodying the Sacred Mysteries, and the Degrees of Initiation, as set forth in later

chapters of this book. He must, therefore, be finally, 'a man Pure and Uncorrupt, his Body transmuted, and in perfect *coalescence* with his Soul and Spirit,—or, in a state of *equilibrium*.'

We have quoted the definition word for word, including the italics and the capitals. Before we have had time to think out the meaning of it, we come upon the actual example of a Redeemed man. To our surprise it is the Penitent Thief.

Now the Penitent Thief of Progressive Redemption is not the Penitent Thief of popular exposition. 'The mind of the reader,' says Mr. Sampson, 'needs to be disabused of the current notions regarding the character of this person, with which common tradition has misrepresented him. He must have been far from the gallows-bird and dangerous criminal that the Christian preacher generally represents him to have been.'

Mr. Sampson does not deny that he was officially a malefactor, that is to say, that he had committed a capital offence against the Roman Empire. Very likely he was one of the Jewish Zealots, men fired with enthusiasm for their national faith and traditions, and fiercely resenting the pusillanimous and cringing subjection of the Jewish Hierarchy to the lordship of the Romans. The Roman tribunal, steadfastly set upon crushing every symptom of insurrectionary activity, made short work of suspected persons captured by the Roman soldiery and brought before them. They might be guilty, or they might not. The evidence was not carefully sifted, and the cross was close at hand.

But the Penitent Thief was not only a probable Zealot, he was probably a disciple of our Lord. Mr. Sampson's words are: 'There is little doubt that this "malefactor" was one of the secret followers of Christ, an Initiate of the Mysteries.' Christ Himself was 'a Master of the Essene Order of the Cross and Serpent.' From the language used by the thief on the cross, and from the reply of Jesus, Mr. Sampson comes to the conclusion that the malefactor was a secret member of the same Order of the Cross and Serpent. 'Remember me,' he said, 'when thou comest into thy kingdom,' and Jesus replied, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.' Both sentences, says Mr. Sampson, betray an intimate acquaintance with the sacred formulas of the Mysteries. 'Thy kingdom' and 'with me in Paradise' were talismanic formulas technically appertaining to the secret doctrine of the Mysteries. They were Signs of a Sacramental nature which linked the Master and the Disciple in the bond of secret communion. The thief on the cross is no example of a sudden 'death-bed' repentance and the conversion from a wicked life and nature; it is the case of a 'faithful Brother and Initiate receiving from the lips of the dying Master that assurance which, in the hour of his darkness, he so greatly needed, that his Eternal Destiny was sure, that death to him was the immediate passage to Eternal Life, that his course was finished, his race run, his crown won.'

In a recent number of the *Harvard Theological Review* (which has not fallen away from the very high ideal set in the early issues) there is an article on the Religious Philosophy of Rudolph EUCKEN. We shall soon be unable to name a theological review or magazine that does *not* contain an article on EUCKEN. This article is notable because the author is in entire sympathy with EUCKEN'S philosophy. It is also enticing because it is wholly occupied with the essential things in that philosophy. The author is Professor Howard N. BROWN of Boston.

To enter into the article at once, Professor BROWN finds the value of EUCKEN'S philosophy to consist in this. EUCKEN maintains a balance between the three supreme realities with which religion has to deal—God, nature, and the human soul. He finds that wherever in all its history religion has failed to maintain itself or to produce

good fruit, the failure has been due to the neglect of one of these three realities. Either God has not been given His due place, as in Buddhism; or man has been belittled, as in Monasticism; or nature has been denied, as in Christian Science.

In Buddhism God was neglected. For in its origin Buddhism was practically an atheistic faith. Its founder taught men to expect no help whatever from God, but to rely solely on the power for self-denial residing in their own will. Human nature, it is true, revenged itself upon this Eastern prince, and made Gautama himself its deity. But it remains until now a religion without a real doctrine of God; and in consequence it has never built up, in the minds of those over whom it has held sway, any robust spiritual life.

Monasticism belittled man. And not only Monasticism. 'For man as man,' says Professor Brown, 'most Christians have manifested, and do still manifest, the utmost contempt.'

And here already almost every reader of Eucken will be arrested—every theological and almost every philosophical reader. For the philosopher, if he is a 'naturalist,' denies that man is more than the evanescent shadow of the real outward world. If he is an 'intellectualist' he holds that the outward world and all that man hopes from it is a delusion, being nothing more than a reflexion of his own inner world of thought. And whatever he is, he rejects the doctrine of human personality as that fact of 'cosmic significance,' which Eucken (in the words of his American interpreter) claims for it. While the theologian, unless he belongs to the newest and least theological school, will be greatly astonished at this attempt to give man a place of importance in the sight of God against whom he has so grievously sinned and come short.

Eucken will meet the theologian and satisfy him. From the philosopher, however, he will demand that personality be restored to man, so that every man may be able to think of himself as a real entity, and not in any sense a succession of states of consciousness. Meantime observe that this is the first fine feature which Professor Brown recognizes in Eucken's philosophy. It restores to their proper place in religion the three essential facts of God, man, and nature.

The second feature to which Professor Brown draws attention is the relation in which Eucken conceives that these three stand to one another. This is the relation. God is to man friendly, and only friendly, while nature is largely antagonistic.

That God is only friendly, Professor Brown accepts 'as a matter of course.' And we may let it pass. That nature is largely antagonistic he takes some trouble to prove. But as the proof proceeds it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that the antagonism of nature is emphasized because it is an essential part of the philosophical system. For it is the antagonism of nature that makes God necessary to man. Religion 'has always been concerned, mainly, with the means for procuring spiritual help amid the trials and hardships that men must bear. If there are no such trials and hardships, if the seeming opposition of nature to man's desires is merely a disguised friendliness, then this quest for divine help is practically useless.' So says Professor Eucken in the language of Professor Brown. And it has an uneasy appearance of reasoning in a circle. But so far it does not seriously matter. There is tribulation enough in life to make us all desire a way out; there are few indeed who do not hear with relief the Divine offer, 'Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden.'

But as we proceed there emerges a more serious difficulty. 'Are God and nature then at strife?' asks the poet. And the philosopher replies with a most emphatic *Yea*. Whatever man tries to do, says Eucken, nature tries to prevent his doing; whatever he does she sets herself to undo. 'It is much to be doubted whether nature ever really

"adopts" any work of human hands. Wherever man has toiled to make visible his thought in wood or stone, nature following after him has done her best to obliterate his monuments. It takes her a long time to effect this in some instances, but she never surrenders the task.'

But again, it does not seem to matter. In a little we shall hear Professor BROWN admitting that nature is not actively antagonistic, that 'for the most part' she is simply indifferent. And all it seems to come to at last is the declaration that, whatever we may say about the flesh and the devil, there is an enemy whom we have to overcome called the world. And to that we all agree.

The third feature of EUCKEN'S philosophy is its insistence on the New Birth. There is the 'mere man,' or 'the petty human,' the man of flesh and sense, man 'born of a woman' in the phrase of the Bible; and there is the 'new man,' the 'spiritual man,' the man who has been born again. For EUCKEN is most emphatic that 'in spiritual life we have to do, not with a mere addition to a life already existent, but with an essentially new life.'

Professor BROWN does not claim for EUCKEN that he has discovered and can tell us precisely where the spiritual man comes from. The wind still bloweth where it listeth. But he does claim that EUCKEN has introduced him to 'high circles of academic thought.' In other words, he has got the fact of the New Birth accepted by philosophy. And the distinction between the old man and the new is the very distinction with which we have been elsewhere made familiar. The old man thinks chiefly of his own things; the new man chiefly of the things of others.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D. LL.D. D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

PART I.

THE following paper was planned, and in great part written, early in A.D. 1901. Publication was delayed, because I had found myself driven to take Lk $22^{15.16}$ in a sense diametrically opposite to the accepted view; and I shrank from once again challenging the general opinion. It seemed better, therefore, to wait and see if the interpretation which I put on those verses would stand the test of time. Now, since Professor Burkitt, Mr. Brooke, and Mr. Box have all independently declared themselves against the generally accepted view, I am able to follow with more confidence in their wake,[1] even though I may perhaps proceed to draw inferences which none of them would accept or approve.

The article was originally intended as one of a series of comments on 1 Corinthians; but it took a wider scope. The series was published in the *Expositor*, 1900 and 1901, and came to an abrupt conclusion: in the *Expositor*, December 1901, p. 401, the writer mentions the reason: 'The succeeding paper of the series, written eight months ago, he desires to think over for another year before printing.' The single year has grown to nine; but the views expressed have not changed, though the paper is enlarged.

Having thus followed the rule of Horace, and reconsidered until the nine years have fully elapsed, I venture to print the speculative explanation of one of the most serious and enigmatic difficulties in the New Testament, the divergence between John and the Synoptists with regard to the day when the Last Supper took place. In the paper that follows the facts are arranged in a certain succession, corresponding generally to the order of historical development, which is not that of simple time;

[1] Mr. Box in *Critical Review*, January 1903, pp. 32–38; Professor Burkitt and Mr. Brooke in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, pp. 569–572: I learn about the first from *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1908, p. 106.

and for the sake of clearness the theory of explanation is stated in a rather too dogmatic fashion, but it is only the desire of brevity that gives the appearance of dogmatism. What is stated is a theory about a great and confessed difficulty; and is not put forward as assured truth.

I. The chief difficulties in the accounts of the Last Supper are:—

1. The Supper occurred on the evening of Thursday (as we think, March 18th, 29 A.D.), and the Crucifixion in the afternoon of the following day, Friday. St. John (with whom evidently St. Paul agreed, 1 Co $5^{7f.}$) declares that the Friday was the day when the Passover was slain, and eaten at sunset; but the Synoptists affirm that the Supper on Thursday night was the regular Passover Feast. John and Paul regard Jesus as the Paschal Lamb, slain on the Friday afternoon: the Synoptists consider that the Paschal Lamb was slain on the Thursday to make ready the Supper of which Jesus and the Twelve partook. According to John the Friday of the Crucifixion was 14 Nisan, according to Mark it was 15 Nisan.

That John was right and the Synoptists wrong in this, seems to be proved even by the Synoptic narrative: so much is now generally admitted. It is inconceivable that the Jews should have permitted the Trial of Jesus and the Crucifixion of Him and of the two criminals to take place after the Passover had been eaten and the Feast had begun. It was the Jews, and not the Romans, who caused the arrest and all its consequences; and John is beyond all question right, even according to the Synoptic testimony, in asserting that the death of Jesus and the two robbers was hurried on in order that the corpses might be disposed of before the Saturday began, *i.e.* before sunset on the Friday, lest the great day should be profaned.

How could the error of the Synoptists, *i.e.* the error of Mark,[1] have been caused? This is an unsolved problem. Professor B. W. Bacon has advanced a theory, which has one element of right in it; he recognizes that the error must have been produced by some wider cause, and that it could not be a mere slip regarding the single detail; but beyond this his theory is unacceptable, for it does not even explain the error; there seems to be no connexion between his cause and the effect.

2. St. John describes the Last Supper without mentioning the incident of the Bread and Wine: he places similar teaching as to the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ at a much earlier stage in the Saviour's career ($6^{31ff.}$). St. Paul and the Synoptists describe the incident of the Bread and Wine as occurring at the Last Supper, and as being the origin of the Eucharistic ceremony in the observance of the Church. St. John seems to imply that the Saviour's teaching at an earlier time was a sufficient cause and origin of the ceremony.

This omission in the Fourth Gospel is remarkable and beyond all question intentional. Our theory is that the error of the Synoptists and the omission by John are connected. John said nothing about the rite of the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper, because an erroneous interpretation of the meaning and importance of that incident had gained currency, and had led to the error made by Mark, and reproduced after him by Matthew and Luke.

There are other differences between the leading accounts of the incident; but they are all slight and purely verbal. The most important are the following:—

3. Paul and Luke describe Jesus as explicitly ordering the repetition of the ceremony: 'This do in remembrance of me.' Justin Martyr also mentions these words, and they were taken into the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. Matthew and Mark do not report that Christ ordered the ceremony to be repeated.

4. It is sometimes said that Luke places the Cup before the Bread: this, however, depends on a false theory of his text, as we shall see. All authorities, except the *Didache*, are agreed that the order was first the Bread, then the Wine[2]; and there can be no doubt that this order was observed always in the Church ritual. Hence the whole rite is regularly called 'the Breaking of the Bread,' according to the action which came first.

5. The variation between the different accounts of the words spoken by Jesus in dividing the Bread and Wine is puzzling, and deserves to be carefully studied.

[1] It may now safely be assumed that the common tradition of the first three Gospels is simply the narrative of Mark, followed by the other two. In the original form of this paper it did not appear safe to assume this without giving reasons. That it can now be taken as generally admitted is a proof of the progress that New Testament study has made.

[2] It has sometimes been thought that Paul puts the Cup first, in 1 Co $10^{16.21}$. This is a mistake, as we shall see.

II. The leading authorities are :—

1. The actual rite as performed in the early Church.

2. Mk 14^{22-25}, repeated by Mt 26^{26-29} with extremely little change.

3. Lk (1) $22^{17.18}$.

4. Lk (2) $22^{19.20}$.

5. Paul in 1 Co 11^{23-26}.

6. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65.

7. Tatian in the *Diatessaron* is a secondary authority, not a primary one; but his choice was guided by a knowledge of the first authority, which was important in the estimation of all the others. The *Didache* gives rather a comment on, than an account of, the rite.

Disregarding minor variations, we may divide the words spoken into the following parts :—

A. The Consecration : i. 'This is my body,' etc. ; ii. 'This is my blood,' etc.

B. The Invitation : i. 'Take, eat'; ii. 'Drink,' etc.

C. The Institution : i. and ii. 'This do in remembrance of me.'

D. The Prophecy : i. 'I will not eat,' etc. ; ii. 'I will no more drink,' etc.

The following table shows how many of these parts are mentioned in each of the written accounts, and also gives the order of the parts.

	i. The Bread.	ii. The Cup.
Matthew . .	B A	B A D
Mark . .	B A	A D
Luke (1) . .	D	B D
Luke (2) . .	A C	A
Paul . . .	A C	A C
Justin . .	C A	A
Tatian . .	D B A	B A D C[1]

In these accounts we observe several striking features.

(1) There is a strong tendency to abbreviate. Even the longest account is, indubitably, far shorter than the actual incident. The desire of the earlier writers was to take only the rigorously necessary words, to concentrate attention on them, and to leave out everything that could be regarded as of secondary importance, or as involved or implied in what was selected for record. In some cases a writer even abbreviates his written authority. Many illustrative examples might be given of the way in which the writers of the New Testament shortened their narrative, omitting words and incidents about which they knew perfectly well, if they thought that these either were not indispensable, or were sufficiently suggested in the context, or were familiar to the readers who were addressed, and might therefore be assumed.

(2) It is therefore supremely unmethodical to argue that because certain words or details are omitted in any Source, therefore the original authority from whom that Source was derived was ignorant of them. In the case of such omissions the proper question to ask first is whether there is any obvious reason why it might seem unnecessary to lengthen the narrative by including them. A good example of this is the following paragraph (3) :—

(3) There is a marked tendency in the writers to omit either B, the Invitation, or C, the Institution. Some give only B, others only C. Tatian's work is avowedly a union of everything that was found in any Gospel. Luke also has both ; but, as will be shown, Luke places side by side two Sources, one of which mentions B and one C. It would be false method to infer from this that some knew only about B, others only about C, but no one knew about both. Should we not rather gather that B, the Invitation to eat and drink, was considered by some to carry with it the Institution for all time—inasmuch as the first occasion and invitation extended to all Christians and included all subsequent occasions—while others, who mentioned the words of Institution, thought that these rendered it unnecessary to quote the Invitation to do on this occasion what was being instituted as a recurring and permanent ceremony ?

In short, bearing in mind that the ceremony was familiar to all readers as the chief mystery of the Church ritual, we see that some understood the command, 'Take eat,' as the first of an eternal series of repetitions, while others understood the Institution, 'This do in remembrance of me,' as implying the command to repeat the whole ceremony with the Invitation (which is tacitly assumed as indispensable).

(4) The accounts do not all come from one Source. There are at least three, perhaps even more, independent Sources. It does not, of course, follow that all those independent Sources originated in the formal narratives of persons

[1] C is evidently intended by Tatian as a sequel to both, being taken either from Luke (who gives it only in i.) or from Paul, who gives it in both i. and ii.

present at the Supper. Some of them were of that kind; but an authority of a totally different kind was used, one that had not the form of mere narrative, but consisted in the ritual reproduction of the acts and words of the Saviour as a ceremony practised in the early Church from the beginning. That the ceremony was repeated from the earliest time in the assemblies of the faithful is almost universally admitted: the theory that it was instituted by Paul has been stated, only to be rejected. This ritual repetition was familiar to all writers, and inevitably exercised much influence on their narratives.

For example, the account of the Eucharist given by Justin Martyr is said by him to be handed down by the Apostles in the Gospels. But, apparently, he quoted their accounts from memory, and his memory was much influenced by the form of words used in the Church ritual as he knew it. Again, the account given by Paul is professedly a statement of the ritual as it was regularly performed in the Church. This knowledge of the rite lay in the mind of every writer whom we possess, and was a strong force acting on them all (with the probable exception of one Source).

It will be best briefly to review the written accounts, one by one, and try to determine their origin and the degree of their dependence on the rite as celebrated in the early Church; but first a word is needed about the rite.

III. The extreme antiquity of the Church rite is almost universally admitted. It began from (or before) the time of the Last Supper. Little need be said on this point, and the little will be most appropriately stated in reference to Luke's and John's testimony.

The names that are most commonly applied to it are in themselves important as evidence. That it was called 'the Breaking of the Bread' proves that this action, as being first, was recognized as the specially characteristic fact in the rite. That it was called the Eucharist (εὐχαριστία in Justin, i. 66) proves that the giving of thanks was the most characteristic feature in the traditional words. All accounts agree that the acts and words were handed down from the Lord, and not changed or modified by any of the Apostles; but there is some disagreement whether Eucharistia or Eulogia was most typical among the words used by the Lord in the Breaking of the Bread.

It cannot be assumed that exactly the same words were used in every celebration of the rite from the beginning onward. Some slight variation is always possible in the oral transmission of a ceremony in which there was a considerable amount of speaking; but there was at least one cause which militated against the admission of any change, namely, the fixed belief among the ancients that the efficacy of religious formulæ depended on the literal correctness with which the words were repeated.

None of the written accounts agrees exactly and entirely with any other in respect of the words uttered. This was not due to deficient respect for the rite or to any idea that the exact words were immaterial. It was due to the fact that none of the writers who are mentioned above aspired to become the norm or law of the ceremony. Each felt and knew that the ceremony was there independent of him and superior to his authority. Each gave an account of the rite from some special point of view: some desired to record the circumstances in which it originated, some to show that a certain character (on which they were anxious to lay stress) was dominant in it. None thought of writing a book of ritual, still less of altering the words or the character of the Eucharist. That rite was the fixed and eternal and divine fact: they were the evanescent and human recorders of circumstances connected with it.

We must therefore regard the Church rite as being, not only the oldest, but also the most authoritative record, though only an oral record, of the words and acts: it was authoritative and final for the writers whose words we read: they all presuppose and assume its existence and familiarity. This is the only true point of view for us; and thus regarded, the varying accounts present no real difficulty.

IV. Among the written accounts we shall find that it is best to begin, not with the earliest, but with the apparently simplest account of the actions of the Saviour at the most memorable point of the Supper; namely, with the account given by Mark, and repeated from him with only the slightest variation by Matthew. The details are thus stated[1]:—

1. He took bread (*i.e.* a loaf, a single whole unit).[2]

[1] The Greek is given in p. 252, note [1].

[2] Paul alone makes the nature of this act quite clear.

2. He spoke a blessing, which is practically the same as He expressed thanks to God.

3. He gave to the Twelve (assuming that they then each ate a piece of the one loaf, as Paul (1 Co 10^{17}) says).

4. He said, 'Take, this is my body.'

5. He took a cup.

6. He gave thanks.

7. He gave to the Twelve.

8. They all drank.

9. He said, 'This is my blood of the covenant poured out for you.'

10. He made a prediction as to not again drinking.

We observe that this narrative is evidently much abbreviated. There is no mention of the Breaking of the Bread, although that part of the rite was afterwards regarded as the typical one, which often gave its name to the whole ceremony; and the act of breaking or dividing the single piece among many was obviously a necessity of the situation. Mark's record leaves it doubtful whether Jesus broke the bread and handed it in pieces separately to the Twelve, or left it to the participants to break it for themselves, each taking a piece off as the single loaf was passed round the table.

Why does Mark leave this matter doubtful? It cannot be that he attached no importance to it, for other accounts and allusions show that from the beginning it was reckoned highly important. It is simply that he took much for granted as familiar to his readers. The Church ceremony was known to all. Mark assumes this knowledge: he assumes that behind his narrative is the background of Church custom, and on this background he paints with a few outlines his picture. His words implied a great deal more than their bare literal content: they were rich with the fulness of his readers' knowledge. He was not writing a history for the ignorant: he was writing a summary for the instructed (intended, perhaps, to be accompanied and supplemented by further oral instruction).

The words, 'Take, this is my body,' can hardly have been unaccompanied by further explanation. If they were not further explained by additional words, they would arouse inevitably questions and thus elicit teaching. If they were uttered alone, they could only be taken as a parable: 'Without a parable spake he not to them.' Some one of the disciples was always ready to ask some elucidation of a dark saying.[1] The evident meaning, as Jesus held the Bread and said the words, was 'This bread represents the breaking of my body in the punishment of death on your behalf,' and the words of the Church rite (as quoted by Paul) show that the ritual repetition of the scene made this meaning explicit. Paul adds the further symbolic principle that 'We who are many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread.' It seems quite possible, or even probable, that between this first action and the giving of the Cup, there elapsed a certain interval,[2] which was occupied with instruction in the meaning of the symbolism.

Matthew gives the opening words as 'Take, eat, this is my body.' Mark omits the word 'eat.' Luke and Paul omit both words 'Take, eat,' but add subsequent words. There is no real discrepancy here. All abbreviate, more or less; but all give enough to recall to the reader the familiar ceremony. What is omitted could readily be supplied by all whom these writers had in mind.

The choice of a different word, 'he gave thanks,' over the Cup, suggests that, while the general character and bearing of the words was the same in each case, Mark understood that there was some difference in form. The *Didache* uses the verb 'give thanks' in both cases, but makes the words, which the celebrants use in the performance of the rite, different in other respects. Paul and Luke, by the expression 'the cup in like manner,' imply that in each case Jesus 'gave thanks,' but not necessarily that the words of thanksgiving were exactly the same. We may safely infer that the words of thanks and blessing differed in the two cases.

Mark says, 'They all drank'; Matthew substitutes for this the command, 'Drink ye all of it.' This deliberate alteration of his authority was made by the composer of the First Gospel in order to bring Mark's account into closer accord with the actual words and actions of the original scene (as we shall find in studying Luke's account). Mark tended to make his narrative full of actions, with few and short speeches.

[1] There is a possibility that no one asked the meaning of the parable, because it had been fully stated by Jesus at an earlier time (as John says), and was familiar to all; and because they knew the custom as characteristic of Jesus.

[2] The expression of Paul and Luke, 'the cup after supper,' suggests that some interval separated the two acts.

Mark and Matthew represent the Saviour as giving a formal explanation of the purpose of the Cup, namely, that this wine is (*i.e.* symbolizes) the blood shed by Him in His death on behalf of mankind in ratification of the Covenant and Promise of God to men. Luke and Paul express the same truth in slightly different form, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood,' and Luke adds 'which is poured out on your behalf.' Probably the difference of form, 'the covenant in my blood' and 'my blood of the covenant,' arises only from variety in the Greek translation of the original Aramaic words spoken by Jesus. The addition of the word 'new' is probably explanatory. Jesus in His teaching, on other occasions and probably also then, spoke of the new Promise and Pledge which God was giving in His death. Mark and Matthew understood that the Covenant was sufficiently defined by the circumstances as 'new': Luke and Paul thought it best to state explicitly that it was new.

Matthew adds an explanatory clause 'for the remission of sins.' This is peculiar to himself, and doubtless is intended, though without written authority, to make clear the meaning which the composer of the Fourth Gospel understood to lie in the words and the situation.

Mark and Matthew add a statement as to the future, which Luke places earlier in the Supper. Our view is that Luke is more strictly correct, and that the change of order made by Mark (or by his oral authority) was due to the desire for brevity. This will become clearer in studying Luke's account.

The most important inference with regard to Mark's narrative is that it presupposes so much knowledge in the reader. Behind it lies the existent Church, with its teaching and ritual. The Eucharistic ceremony is understood to be familiar to all, and is therefore implied to be an old and established rite in the Christian society. The simplicity of his narrative is therefore only apparent. He attains much brevity and simplicity by assuming so much.

Further, he assumes the recurring ritual. He does not even mention the Institution of the Church ceremony. It did not lie in his purpose to mention what every reader knew. His intention was, in his own brief style, to record the dramatic symbolism which was embodied in the ceremony. The first performance was an acted and spoken parable (accompanied probably by much more explanation than is recorded in any Gospel). To infer, however, from his omission of the words of Institution that he did not know about the Church ceremony, or that he thought it unimportant, is to misconceive profoundly his purpose and point of view.

Yet it is hardly possible to read Mark's account (repeated by Matthew) without inferring that he regarded the Institution of the Eucharist as a Christian accompaniment and sequel to the Passover. The meal is described by him as the Passover[1] (though nothing he tells, except the preparations (14^{12-16}), indicates that it was that feast).[2] For some unknown reason, the idea had taken possession of his mind, that the Supper was the Passover, although (as has been pointed out by others) some of the things which he elsewhere records are inconsistent with this idea. What was the cause of this misapprehension? It must be associated with an idea that the Passover was in some way connected with the Eucharist, so that the latter Christianized the former. To John the slaying of the Passover was translated into Christianized form as the slaying of Christ; and the two events coincided in time. To Mark the slaying of the Passover was the preparation for the Last Supper, because the ceremony of the Bread and the Cup was an anticipation and prophecy and interpretation of the Death.

If the existing ritual was known to Mark, and assumed by him as the background of his picture and well known to all his readers, the question arises whether the rite was his authority, or whether he had some source of information independent of the Church ceremony. The answer will probably not be doubted. He possessed another authority, probably an oral authority; but in using this source, he had regard to the information with which his readers were familiar in the Church ritual. His narrative has not the appearance of being simply

[1] Spitta in his *Urchristenthum* regards this part of the Synoptic narrative as an interpolation, while he thinks that an account of the rite was originally given in the Fourth Gospel (chap. 13), but dropped out. All such theories we regard as due to thorough misconception.

[2] (1) ^{12} 'On the first day of unleavened bread, when they were sacrificing the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and (2) make ready, that thou mayest eat the passover? . . . (3) ^{14} guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? . . . (4) ^{16} they made ready the passover.' Similarly in Matthew and in Luke (who also depends on Mark up to this point, where the preparations are complete).

an account of the rite. His differences from the ritual are not reasonably explicable except on the supposition that he possessed another authority, to which he attached a value at least equal to that of the ritual as he knew it, so that he does not hesitate to make slight variations and to describe surrounding circumstances which throw light on the ritual. The preceding part of his narrative leads up to this incident: the sequel presupposes it: therefore the incident must be an integral part of the narrative, and cannot merely be taken from the Church ceremony.

IV. Paul mentions the Eucharistic rite twice in his first letter to the Corinthians (10^{16-22} 11^{18-34}). From the first passage, which is allusive rather than descriptive, it might readily be inferred (1) that the Cup came before the Bread (as in the *Didache*, and in some manuscript forms of the Lucan account): this might very well seem to follow from the agreement of vv.[16. 21];[1] (2) that the word 'bless,' and not 'give thanks,' was believed by Paul to be the Saviour's words as He gave the Bread (v.[16]); the word 'bless' is used also by Mark (and Matthew), whereas Luke says, 'He gave thanks.'

If Paul had mentioned the Eucharist only once in this letter, these two inferences would probably have been generally accepted. Fortunately, he has also given a formal description of the rite, and we see that they are both wrong. In his experience the Bread was before the Cup, and Jesus 'gave thanks' over the Bread.[2] This is a typical and instructive example of the necessity of exercising the greatest care in drawing inferences from allusions. Paul had some reason in 10^{16} for alluding to the Cup before the Bread. The reason apparently was that he is here contrasting two superficially analogous ceremonies, pagan and Christian, and showing their absolutely opposite nature and opposite effect; and he names the Cup before the Bread, partly because the more important part of the pagan ceremony lay in the drinking of the wine, and partly because the common food in the pagan ceremony was not bread, but something eaten out of a dish. The emphasis laid on the breaking by the leader and the eating by all in common of one loaf was probably due to the Founder of the Christian rite, whereas the common meal of the pagan religious societies and brotherhoods probably followed the usual practice of simple Oriental meals, in which each guest has his own loaf, though all eat from a common dish.[3] Paul was not thinking of the order of the Christian ceremony in 1 Co 10; he was emphasizing the contrast between it and the pagan ceremony, and mere temporal order is of no consequence. Hence also, probably, he uses the words 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' instead of 'give thanks': the former expression seemed to him to bring out into more marked prominence the distinctive feature of the Christian rite and its strongest difference from the pagan. His whole mind is occupied with the intention of emphasizing differences, not of picturing the details of the Christian ceremony exactly in their sequence.

In order to understand and to draw correct inferences from Paul (or from any other ancient writer), we must put ourselves at his point of view, and sympathize with his intention at the moment; then we shall see the subject in the same perspective in which he saw it, with the same details standing out prominently. The difference between 'bless' and 'give thanks' was to Paul a mere trifle. The two words are analogous in formation and closely akin in meaning. 'To bless' is really 'to say good words,' in Arab phrase 'to name the name of God,'[4] *i.e.* to give thanks to God. It is quite probable that Paul knew that, in telling the story of that Supper, some used the word 'bless,' and some used the word 'give thanks': the difference is one merely of Greek words, the meaning is practically much the same whichever word is used.

[1] τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; (1 Co 10^{16}). οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων· οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων ([21]). Compare Mark, καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξαὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (14^{22-24}).

[2] 1 Co 11^{23}.

[3] This was pointed out in my article on the 'Religion of Greece and Asia Minor' in Hastings' *D.B.*, v. pp. 127A, 129B, 132B.

[4] I am quoting from a saying of Robertson Smith, who in conversation (perhaps some one will be able to quote it from one of his books), declared 'There are three rules of Mohammedan etiquette at table: (1) Name the name of God, *i.e.* say grace; (2) Eat only with the right hand; (3) Eat of that part of the dish that is next to you.' For the benefit of Western readers it is perhaps well to remind them that the rules apply to a meal eaten with the fingers, without knives or forks, out of a single common dish.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION XXI. 1.

I.

A NEW HEAVEN AND A NEW EARTH.

'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away.'—R.V.

1. These words open the description of the last great vision of the Apocalypse. It is a vision of the 'Bride' of Christ, and it is in two parts. First there is a vision of the New World (21^{1-8}), and next of the New City (21^{9}–22^{5}). The New World is the place where the redeemed are to dwell. The redeemed of God are new men in Christ Jesus, and they need a new Heaven and a new Earth to dwell in.

2. 'I am very fond,' says Dr. Rendel Harris, 'of tracing out the history—what we call the evolution—of a doctrine, because doctrines do not always just drop down into the world ready-made. It means that God has been unfolding His thought to men, and they, with their lesser thoughts, have been trying to apprehend it, perhaps first from one side and then from another side, until at last they arrive at some definite and approximately final statement, and call it "a Christian doctrine."'[1] The doctrine of a new Heaven and a new Earth is found in Isaiah (65^{17} 66^{22}). It is found in the Apocrypha (Enoch $45^{4f.}$, 'I will transform the heaven, and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing'). And it is found again in the New Testament (2 P 3^{13}). It is the counterpart of man's personal salvation from sin, that his life shall be spent under new circumstances and in a new world.

3. Where is the New World to be found? Is it on the other side of the grave, or on this side? The question probably did not occur to St. John; it is certainly not considered by him. In our modern thinking about the future we have disarranged the centre of gravity. We draw a sharp distinction between the life that we are now living and the life after death. That distinction was quite subordinate in St. John's mind. With him the great distinction was between the life lived to the flesh and the life lived to the Spirit. The dividing line was not physical death, but the acceptance of Christ. The new heaven and the new earth is the abode of the redeemed in Christ, whether they have passed through death or not. And there is no doubt that to the Seer's mind it is the very heaven above us and the very earth beneath us that are made new.

> Let us have done with 'postponed heavens.' We want to understand how much of God is to be known in this life, and how much of the joy of God is to be known in this world. Such an understanding and such an experience is the only reasonable preparation for the life and blessedness of the world to come. I would be a Secularist on the non-Christian plan, if it were not that, happily, I am a Secularist already on the Christian plan. I understand that a great many of those people who say that this life is the right stage on which to see recovered good and banished evil are preaching the true Gospel, and that it is the Gospel of the New Testament. Now, of course, we apply this first of all to the individual, and we begin with the individual because we understand that that is God's way of dealing with the world. There is no gospel which does not proclaim the regeneration of the individual. But he tells us also that there is going to be a restored social order. It is called 'New Jerusalem.'[2]

4. For the word 'new' does not mean something that has not been before. It means something that has a new appearance, a new character. There are two chief Greek words translated 'new.' The one (*neos*) refers to time, 'recent'; the other (*kainos*) refers to quality, or fitness for use, 'fresh.' In Lk 5^{38} ('new wine must be put into new wine-skins') we find both words. The wine is of recent vintage; but the wine-skins may have been made some time ago, only they have not yet been used. The new tomb in which our Lord was laid may not have been recently hewn, but it had never yet been occupied. So the new heaven and the new earth may be new in the sense of never being before in existence, but that is not what is stated; it is that they are new in character, fit for the use to which they are now to be put.

5. And so we have not to wait until the first heaven and the first earth are passed away before we find ourselves in the new heaven and the new earth. It is the coming of the new that causes the passing of the old. Although it is a trans-

[1] *Union with God*, 26.

[2] J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 20.

formation, and possibly nearly imperceptible, the transformation does not take place by the progress of the old world in civilization, but by the introduction of a new world which causes the old to give place. The sloughing of the serpent's skin is due to the growth of the new skin beneath. Our great teacher, Robert Browning, in the poem named after Cleon, in whom he pictures the perfection of civilized man, makes him speak of this world's culture as a watch-tower, a treasure fortress, which the soul has built to overlook the flats of natural life. Yet, alas!

> The soul now climbs it, just to perish there,

—to perish at the sight of a world of capability for joy, spread round it, meant for it, inviting it; and the soul craves it all; and still it may not taste of that wide enjoyment one jot more than it could when it knew so much less of it, ere it built its tower, and climbed up to look abroad. Therefore

> Man sees the wider, but to sigh the more:
> Most progress is most failure.[1]

6. How may the new heaven and the new earth be recognized? Not so much by alteration in matter as in spirit; not so much by a change in them as in us. Life will be lived, (1) upon new conditions, (2) with a new dignity, (3) under a new character, (4) in a new liberty.

1. *New Conditions.*—A man's life is much affected by his environment, by the nature of the world he lives in. The present world may be perfect as a place for the training and discipline of life. But the discipline involves much pain and suffering. In the new world, even if the moral tests remain, there will be no more pain; sorrow and sighing shall flee away.[2] It will be a reformed world, a world of social reformation—work and work for all, but no drudgery. And all this will come from within, not from without.

The people who talk to us about reform do not strike down as deep into the nature of things as this. I hope I am a good reformer, in the right sense of the word. I want to see everything wrong put right—'strikes,' and all the rest of it. But the worst strike in the world is the strike against the will of God; the most terrible lock-out is when we resist blessedness and find presently that the Master of the house hath shut to the door. Our defect lies in our want of submission to God's law within.[3]

[1] H. S. Holland, *Christ or Ecclesiastes*, 121.
[2] R. Vaughan, *Stones from the Quarry*, 149.
[3] J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 31.

2. *New Dignity.*—Man was made for a little while lower than the angels, but God's ultimate purpose for him was that he should take princely rank. 'Henceforth,' says Jesus, 'I call you not servants, but I have called you friends.' It is a recovery of the lost fellowship which Adam had in the first Paradise. And the recovery being through the Son, it confers sonship and joint heirship with Christ. Working by way of mere civilization, we claim that 'A man's a man for a' that.' Working by way of the cross, we claim fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.

Ever since I can recollect scientific men have been looking for what they call the missing link. What is the missing link that they look for? They say that they think there is somewhere an organism that will link you with the beast, with the newt, with the worm. Now, it is not for us to say whether they will find that link or not. They may find it. It is not the business of the Church to pronounce in such a question; it is for intellectual men to solve that according to the facts that they discover; and I neither know nor care whether they will find the link that binds us to the under world. I am not concerned about that, but why don't you lift your eyes and look at the other end of the chain and see the glorified Jesus? You cannot find the link although you are groping for it in the dirt that binds you to the world of dust and darkness, but at the other end of the chain there is a golden link that binds you to God, to immortality, to heaven, to eternity. Lift your eyes, lift your hearts. Whether you spring out of the dirt or no, you need not trouble, but here you see your kinship with God and know that you are heirs of immortality.[4]

3. *New Character.*—In the first Paradise Adam is spoken of as perfect in his innocence, the innocence of an untried child. Into the new Paradise one has entered, who has been made perfect *through suffering*. And with Him have entered those who have come out of the great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. There is a grandeur about these men in the new Paradise that does not belong to the men in the garden of Eden. The garden of Gethsemane has done more for men than the garden of Eden did.

Some time ago there was a flower show in London, and the singularity was that all the flowers were grown in London. It is not much for you to grow flowers in the country. With your blue skies, your sweet air, your bright light, and your silver dew, it is nothing to you to rear magnificent blossoms and perfect forms of elegance and of colour. But think of growing prize lilies and roses and orchids and palms on narrow window-sills, and in dingy cellars, and in dusty attics, and amongst chimney-pots.[5]

[4] W. L. Watkinson, in *Christian World Pulpit*, liii. 394.
[5] *Ibid.* liii. 395.

4. *New Liberty.*—There was only partial liberty in Eden; for untried innocence must always be faced with a 'Thou shalt not.' And the trial always ends in disobedience and expulsion. Then follows the long struggle in which the seed of the serpent bruises the heel of the seed of the woman. But at last the victory is won through Christ. Into the new Paradise there enters nothing that 'maketh a lie.' And the redeemed have the right to enjoy the fruit of every tree that the garden contains.

If you are free in Christ your world shall leap to help you. And freedom comes by faith. Believe in Christ, and let Him lead you to His Father, and nothing can hold you prisoner or keep you from being all that His Father and your Father made you to be.

Ah, so may all be free!
Then shall the world grow sweet at core and sound,
And, moved in blest and ordered circuit, see
The bright millennial sun rise fair and round,
Heaven's day begin, and Christ, whose service is
Freedom all perfect, rule the world as His.[1]

7. Is it only a vision? It is a vision, but 'only' is out of place. For everything that we know of God is staked upon the reality and the fulfilment of it. St. John says, 'I saw.' How did he see? First, he had his own heart's need. Next, he had the promises of Scripture that his need would be met. Then he had Christ, the historical fact and all that faith found in Him. And last of all, he had, as the gift of Christ, the spirit of revelation. All these things went together, and were bound into one grand conviction by the Seer's knowledge of the Name of God. And when he said he saw, it was no venture, but the final and full assurance.

Is it slow in coming? It may be nearer than we think.

Say not the struggle nought availeth,
The labour and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,
And as things have been they remain.

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke concealed,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright.[2]

[1] P. Brooks, *The More Abundant Life*, 86.

Literature.

On 'New.'—Article in The Expository Times, xii. 233, with the literature there cited.

On the New Heaven and the New Earth.—R. W. Church, *Pascal and Other Sermons*, 326; H. S. Holland, *Christ or Ecclesiastes*, 117; J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 17; R. Vaughan, *Stones from the Quarry*, 148; C. J. Vaughan, *Temple Sermons*, 66; J. Vaughan, *The Brighton Pulpit*, No. 826; E. F. Sampson, *Christ Church Sermons*, 159; M. Nicholson, *Communion with Heaven*, 294; D. Swing, *Sermons*, 181; *Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd ser. iii. 106 (F. Schleiermacher); *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxii. 73 (P. W. Darnton); xliii. 293 (H. S. Holland); xliv. 401 (A. H. Bradford); liii. 393 (W. L. Watkinson); lxxii. 292 (B. S. Lloyd).

II.

No More Sea.

'And the sea is no more.'—R.V.

1. We love the sea. A preacher who spent his holiday in Braemar, writes enthusiastically of its frowning mountains, the silver streak of its beautiful river, the inspiration of its bracing air. But it lacked one thing. There was no glimpse to be had of the sea.[3]

A little girl friend of mine, whose home was by one of the great sea-lochs of the West Highlands, was being taught about heaven by her mother, and was told that there would be no sea. 'Then,' she said, 'I shall not like it.' All the child's pleasures nearly were associated with the sea—bathing, fishing, boating. On that changeful coast what is one hour mist and dulness and gloom, grey rock and wan water, is the next a fairyland of lights and colours most strange and beautiful, on which to look is enough delight. All island and peninsular nations are lovers of the sea. When Xenophon's Greeks, retreating after the battle of Cunaxa, came, after long desert marches and conflicts, in sight of the Black Sea, they burst out into joyous cries—'Thalassa! Thalassa!' A modern poet has expressed the strange fascination that the sea has for the men of these isles, in spite of all its fickleness and changes, thus:

'Ye that bore us, O restore us!
She is kinder than ye;
For the call is on our heart-strings,'
Said the men of the sea.

[2] Clough, *Poems* (ed. 1888), 452.
[3] W. Hay, *God's Looking-Glass*, 116.

'Ye that love us, can ye move us?
She is dearer than ye;
And your sleep will be the sweeter,'
Said the men of the sea.

'Oh, our fathers in the churchyard,
She is older than ye;
And our graves will be the greener,'
Said the men of the sea.

In England there is too much of the blood of the old Northmen, the Sea King's followers, for men to dread the sea. It has been the means of winning empire, the path of adventure, the rough foster-mother of all manly qualities, and the defence of our freedom.[1]

2. But the sea did not appeal in this way to the Israelites. They never were sailors. In the only period of their history in which they did much voyaging their ships were manned by Phœnicians —'shipmen that had knowledge of the sea.' And St. John had special reasons for disliking it. We know that he took no merely material interest in the future, and that when he says 'the sea was no more,' he was drawing no map of the geography of the new heaven and the new earth. But he had his reasons for choosing the symbol of the sea, for using it as a figure of the things which were to be absent from the world of the redeemed.

One of the things which fascinated the mind of St. John respecting the new city, was the singular *absence* of many things which characterize the cities of earth. His description of the New World is as remarkable for its omissions as for its possessions. The familiar chapter which embodies our text illustrates this truth, and shows that there is a benediction in every negation.[2]

3. What, then, does the sea stand for?

1. *Mystery.*—It is largely a mystery still. It is largely unfathomed and unknown. It is our great undiscovered continent.

Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear.

It is itself a mystery. Says Jefferies, 'There is an infinite possibility about the sea; it may do what it is not recorded to have done. It is not to be ordered. It may overleap the bounds human observation has fixed for it. It has a potency unfathomable. There is still something in it not quite grasped and understood—something still to be discovered—a mystery.'

[1] J. T. Forbes, *God's Measure*, 77.
[2] See H. S. Seekings, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxviii. 195.

This aspect of the sea impressed itself upon the Israelites. 'Thy way,' says the Psalmist, 'was in the sea, and thy paths in the great waters, and thy footsteps were not known.' And so Cowper:

God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

The mystery of the sea is a figure of the mystery of life. It is an aspect of life that appeals to every one. 'This world,' said Charles Dickens, 'is a world of sacred and solemn mystery; let no man despise it or take it lightly.' Christina Rossetti sings:

The mystery of Life, the mystery
Of Death I see
Darkly, as in a glass;
Their shadows pass,
And talk with me.[3]

Emerson tells of two members of the United States Senate who used every opportunity of leisure to discuss speculative subjects. After a time one of them retired, and the two did not meet for twenty-five years. Then one of them asked, 'Any light, Albert?' 'None,' was the reply. After a pause the other inquired, 'Any light, Lewis?' and again the answer was 'None.'[4]

The prophets have felt the mystery of life more than all others, and St. John was a prophet. Often had he prayed with Job, 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!' Then Jesus came and called him. The mystery of the past, of the present, of the future—all the mystery of life was dispelled. He knew that in the redeemed world there would be no baffling questions remaining. 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

Heaven overarches earth and sea,
Earth-sadness and sea-bitterness.
Heaven overarches you and me:
A little while and we shall be—
Please God—where there is no more sea
Nor barren wilderness.

Heaven overarches you and me,
And all earth's gardens and her graves.
Look up with me, until we see
The day break and the shadows flee.
What though to-night wrecks you and me
If so to-morrow saves?[5]

[3] See R. J. Campbell, *City Temple Sermons*, 235.
[4] H. S. Seekings, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxviii. 196.
[5] Christina G. Rossetti, *Works*, 1904, p. 286.

2. *Treachery.*—The Israelites were struck with the restlessness of the sea. But its restlessness suggested purpose. It was uncertain. It could not be counted upon. There was something akin to treachery in its moods. 'It is the scene,' says Dr. Macmillan, 'alternately of the softest dalliance, and the fiercest rage of the elements. Now it lies calm and motionless as an inland lake—without a ripple on its bosom—blue as the sapphire sky above—golden with the reflexion of sunset clouds —silvery with the pale mystic light of moon and stars; and now it tosses its wild billows mountains high, and riots in the fury of the storm. One day it steals softly up the shore, kissing the shells and pebbles with a gentle sigh as though they were gifts of love; the next it dashes its white-crested waves, laden with wrecks and corpses, against the iron rocks. Treacherous and deceitful it lures the mariner on by its beauty, until completely in its power; and then it rises up suddenly in fury, and with an overflowing flood carries him away.'[1]

'You can domesticate mountains,' says Oliver Wendell Holmes, 'but the sea is *ferae naturae.* It is feline. It licks your feet—its huge flanks purr very pleasantly for you, but it will crack your bones and eat you, for all that, and wipe the crimsoned foam from its jaws as if nothing had happened.'[2]

St. John had had experience of the treachery of the sea in the early days of his manhood on the Sea of Galilee. And now as he looked back upon his life, what had the outward circumstances of it been but a sea of uncertainty, and even treachery? But the redeemed have sought and found a kingdom that cannot be moved. They have come to a city that hath foundations. In the New Earth the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

I have desired to go
  Where Springs not fail,
To fields where flies no sharp and sided hail,
  And a few lilies blow.

And I have asked to be
  Where no storms come,
Where the green swell is in the havens dumb,
  And out of the swing of the sea.[3]

[1] *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 303.
[2] *Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table.*
[3] Gerard Hopkins, S.J.

3. *Separation.*—This, we may be sure, was the chief thought in the mind of St. John as he stood on some rock in the little lonely isle of Patmos and looked out across the sea. His eye was toward Jerusalem. For he was an Israelite with an Israelite's love of Mount Zion, the place where God delights to dwell.

When the Covenanters were shut up on the Bass Rock, it would not be with ideas of the freedom and beauty of the sea that their minds would be filled. They would pace the rocky height, feeling that the briny belt of water round them was their most effectual prison guard. Beyond there lay the sunny Lothians, with their rich corn lands, their breezy promontories, their wild moors; and at their feet the waves spent themselves against the cliff's foot with moans like the dirge of their captivity.[4]

St. John was an Israelite, and therefore the sea had in itself few of the attractions which it possesses for an island people like ourselves. But besides that it was the symbol of separation and exile. In Christ he had learned the meaning of the word *philadelphia*, 'brotherly love.' He loved the brethren, fulfilling the New Commandment, 'that ye should love one another as I have loved you.' And the sea now separated him from them. In the New World there will be no sea of separation. All will be one, and all will be together.

Yes, in the sea of life enisled,
  With echoing straits between us thrown,
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,
  We mortal millions live alone.
The islands feel the enclasping flow,
And thus their endless bounds they know.

But when the moon their hollows lights,
  And they are swept by balms of spring,
And in their glens on starry nights
  The nightingales divinely sing,
And lovely notes from shore to shore
Across the sounds and channels pour—

Oh, then a longing like despair
  Is to their farthest caverns sent;
For surely once, they feel, we were
  Parts of a single continent.
Now round us spreads the watery plain;
Oh, might our marges meet again!

Who ordered that their longing's fire
  Should be, as soon as kindled, cooled?
Who renders vain their deep desire?
  A God, a God their severance ruled,
And bade betwixt their shores to be
The unplumbed, salt, estranging sea.

[4] J. T. Forbes, *God's Measure*, 78.

LITERATURE.

No more Sea.—A. Maclaren, *Sermons in Manchester*, ii. 325; H. Macmillan, *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 291; J. T. Forbes, *God's Measure*, 75; R. J. Campbell, *City Temple Sermons*, 234; T. Spurgeon, *Down to the Sea*, 45; C. H. Spurgeon, *Evening by Evening*, 356; D. Burns, *Sayings in Symbol*, 85; W. Hay, *God's Looking-Glass*, 116; G. Matheson, *Moments on the Mount*, 32; A. Moody Stuart, *The Path of the Redeemed*, 178; C. H. Parkhurst, *The Blind Man's Creed*, 219; H. Bushnell, *Moral Uses of Dark Things*, 402; *Christian World Pulpit*, lii. 374 (Burkitt), lxviii. 195 (Seekings).

Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.

BY THE REV. P. J. MACLAGAN, M.A., D.PHIL., SWATOW.

III.

Lao-tsze's Ethical and Political Teaching.

FROM the description of Lao-tsze's Golden Age we can already see what his ethical and political teaching must be.

His ethical principle is the paradoxical 'Act non-action.' By this we are to understand abstinence from all effort of will, the abnegation of self-determination in favour of spontaneity. Action of some kind, of course, there must be. Let it be natural, the expression of your innermost being, not of your will. Let Tao, immanent in you, act through you. Lao-tsze thus calls us back to the unity of our true life from the distractions of the senses. 'The five colours make man's eyes blind: the five tones make his ears deaf: the five flavours make his mouth dull: galloping and hunting make his heart mad: goods difficult of acquisition make his conduct hurtful. Therefore the sage acts for the belly (*i.e.* for the inner man) and not for the eye (the outwardly directed senses). He puts away that and grasps this.' It must not be thought that Lao-tsze is here merely reiterating the commonplace though very necessary warning against allowing ourselves to be seduced by the variegated world of sense, or merely pointing out the baleful effects of passion on the inner life. His doctrine is more thoroughgoing than that. He would withdraw us from any deliberate following of impulse, higher as well as lower. And to enforce his lesson he appeals to what seems to him the majestic indifference of nature. 'Heaven and earth are not benevolent: they look on all things as straw-dogs. The sage is not benevolent: he looks on the people as straw-dogs.' The straw-dogs, Legge explains, were made of straw tied up in the shape of dogs, and used in praying for rain. When the sacrifice was over they were thrown aside. 'The illustration,' Legge goes on to say, 'does not seem a happy one.' It is not so much the illustration that I would object to as the doctrine illustrated. The doctrine, however, is stated too clearly to be mistaken. Tao, blind spontaneity, gives rise to this world of things, and acts in all, and would act in us if only we did not cross and thwart it by our willings and desires, benevolent as well as malevolent.

When we find Lao-tsze adducing Heaven and Earth as the exemplars of the serene indifference he preaches, we are reminded of the lesson which M. Arnold drew from 'the intense clear star-sown vault of Heaven,' and from the sea's expanse:

> And with joy the stars perform their shining
> And the sea its long moon-silvered roll;
> For self-poised they live, nor pine with noting
> All the fever of some differing soul.
> Bounded by themselves and unregardful,
> In what state God's other works may be,
> In their own tasks all their powers pouring,
> These attain the mighty life you see.

To the poet's yearning that his soul might become 'vast' like these, there comes the answer, 'Wouldst thou be as these are? Live as they.'

Only one might claim for the Chinese thinker the superiority—perhaps the inconsistent superiority—of still having an outlook on the troubled world, in the doctrine which we shall find Lao-tsze preaching, that the 'self-poised' sage will by his influence allay 'the fever' of the distracted world.

This 'Act non-action,' then, is Lao-tsze's fundamental ethical doctrine, and it is, of course, in its

light that we must estimate the value and real meaning of Lao-tsze's several ethical precepts, his famous 'Repay injury with kindness,' his insistence on humility, the saying which has been translated, 'To the not-good I would be good in order to make them good.' Utterances such as these are said to 'secure to Lao-tsze the glory of having anticipated the lofty morality of the Sermon on the Mount.' I frankly confess that it is distasteful to me to say anything to diminish this glory. As a Christian missionary I would be glad to meet with such precepts in a non-Christian teacher. We as preachers of the Gospel have nothing to gain by lowering their moral value. If in any sense the law, even as formulated by non-Christian lips, is a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, then the more lofty and austere it is, the greater is its preparatory use as inspiring the effort after perfection and as convicting of failure. It illustrates more clearly the fatal schism between our knowledge of what is good and our will to do it, and makes more conspicuous the incomparable excellence of Him who was, as well as taught, the Truth. And, further, the more the precepts of Christian morality can be paralleled or approached by the maxims of non-Christian teachers, the more we missionaries are taught to recognize that the peculiarity of Christianity, that, therefore, which should be prominent in our preaching, is not morality but grace, the grace of forgiveness and of God's Holy Spirit. It is not, then, a Christian bias but exegetical accuracy which leads me to question the loftiest meanings which have, as I think, been read into the precepts and virtues of Taoism. For instance, can anything have a more Christian sound than 'Recompense an injury with kindness'? But is this really what Lao-tsze said? I am afraid not. We must remember that the word here translated 'kindness' is Teh, which in our Classic has a special meaning. This meaning we can hardly dismiss here. I question, indeed, whether Teh ever means 'kindness.' It means virtue, character which embodies the moral principle, which moral principle we must therefore know before we can tell what the corresponding virtue is. Now the moral principle of Taoism is Tao, and Tao is, as we have seen, pure spontaneity. Then the corresponding virtue (Teh), the manifestation of Tao, is spontaneous action. In short, the maxim 'Recompense an injury with kindness' should rather run 'Recompense an injury by being your true self, since your true self is Tao, by indifference, by going on in your own way.' This may or may not be better than revenge or even than retributive justice. It is certainly not the Christian law of kindness to enemies.

Again, there is much that is attractive in Lao-tsze's insistence on humility, and much that seems akin to our Lord's words, 'Whosoever would be great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant.' 'The highest excellence,' says Lao-tsze, 'is like water. The excellence of water appears in its benefiting all things, and in its occupying without striving the low place which all men dislike. Hence it is akin to Tao.' 'The sage, wishing to be above men, puts himself by his words below them, and wishing to be before them places his person behind them.' 'Hence the sage is able to accomplish his great achievements. It is through his not making himself great that he can accomplish them.' But here, too, we must recognize that the humility of which Lao-tsze speaks is neither the humility which is the inseparable companion of reverence for the Supreme Good, nor the spirit of self-sacrificing love for others. It is merely the passivity and plasticity which are indicated by its symbol water, indeterminateness as contrasted with the definiteness of self-determination. I do not deny, of course, that even this may have an ethical value. If we must seek a Christian analogue to it, we may find one in that unreluctant acceptance of the Divine Will revealed in Providence, which is one of the notes of saintship.

Or to take the other utterance which has been brought forward as one of Lao-tsze's glories, 'To the not-good I would be good in order to make them good'; here, too, 'good,' of course, means good in a Taoist sense. In the chapter from which this saying is quoted we have a hint of what this goodness is. 'The sage has in the world an appearance of indecision, and keeps his mind in a state of indifference to all.' In another chapter we have an equivalent of the saying we are discussing, and the vaunted 'To the not-good I would be good in order to make them good' sounds less Christian, does it not, when translated into this equivalent, which runs, 'I will do nothing and the people will be transformed of themselves'?

While thus insisting that the maxims of the *Tao Teh King* must be interpreted, if we would get at their meaning in Lao-tsze's system, by the light of

Lao-tsze's central principle, I am as ready as any one to admit that many of them are admirable in their Chinese expression and in their illustrations, and are easily receptive of a Christian meaning. Here, for instance, is an ingenious illustration of the usefulness of being nothing, which at once appeals to the homiletic instinct, 'Clay is fashioned into vessels, but it is on their empty hollowness that their use depends.' Here is a witty criticism of ambitious vanity, 'He who stands on his tiptoes does not stand steadily.' Here are fresh illustrations of the familiar Μηδὲν ἄγαν. 'It is better to leave a vessel unfilled than to attempt to carry it when full. If you keep feeling a point that has been sharpened, the point cannot long preserve its sharpness. When gold and jade fill the hall, their possessor cannot keep them safe. When wealth and honours lead to arrogancy, this brings evil on itself. When the work is done and one's name is becoming distinguished, to withdraw into obscurity is the way of Heaven.'

A very few words will suffice to bring before us Lao-tsze's political theory. His aim is, of course, to bring back the golden age of instinctive morality and the simple life. In chap. 81 he tells us plainly what his ideal is. 'In a little state with a small population I would so order it that though there were individuals with the abilities of ten or a hundred men, there should be no employment for them. I would make the people, while looking on death as a grievous thing, yet not remove elsewhere to avoid it. . . . I would make the people return to the use of knotted cords (as helps to memory instead of using written characters). They should think their food sweet, their clothes beautiful, their dwellings places of rest, and their common ways sources of enjoyment. There should be a neighbouring state within sight, and the voices of the fowls and dogs should be heard all the way from it to us, but I would make the people to old age, even to death, not have any intercourse with it.' Lao-tsze diagnoses the causes of 'the present discontents.' 'The people are difficult to govern because of the activity of their superiors in governing them.' 'The difficulty in governing the people arises from their having much knowledge. He who tries to govern a state by his wisdom is a scourge to it; while he who does not try to do so is a blessing.' Lao-tsze's panacea, the application of which would make time run backwards and the Golden Age return, is easily guessed. 'In the kingdom the multiplication of prohibitive enactments increases the poverty of the people; . . . the more display there is of legislation the more thieves and robbers there are. Therefore a sage has said, "I will do nothing, and the people will be transformed of themselves. . . . I will manifest no ambition, and the people will of themselves attain to the primitive simplicity."' This same thought Lao-tsze also gives us in a metaphor more quaint perhaps than clear. 'Governing a great state is like cooking a small fish'—white-bait, for instance, which requires little handling before being committed to the pan or while in it.

Lao-tsze's politics, then, are the simple extension of his Ethics. Where we may feel some difficulty is no doubt in our inability to share his belief that if the sage, strictly exemplifying Taoist ethics, 'does nothing,' the people will transform themselves and the ideal Taoist kingdom be realized. This is to overstrain our faith in the doctrine of *laisser faire*. Indeed, even Lao-tsze seems at times to fall from the height of his theoretical belief. He seems to admit, *e.g.*, that war is sometimes unavoidable. For him, however, the transition from his ethics to his politics is made easier by the characteristically Chinese doctrine of Example, or perhaps we should rather say of Influence. It is a very real doctrine to the Chinese. Does not, or at least did not every schoolboy learn that the mother of Mencius thrice changed her abode before she could find a suitable neighbourhood for the upbringing of her son? Did not the criminal code visit with punishment not only the parricide but the parricide's neighbours, whose influence had failed to restrain him? Example is too narrow a word. The influences which proceed from man, the ideal man, the sage, extend beyond humanity, and are even cosmic in their scope, so that *Man* makes up with Heaven and Earth the Triad of the Powers. 'If a feudal prince or the king could guard and hold the Tao, all would spontaneously submit themselves to him. Heaven and Earth under its guidance unite together and send down the sweet dew.' A doctrine which seems so extravagant, and which is so persistent in Chinese thought, deserves a fuller investigation than can here be undertaken. I should like to see it related in the way of connexion and contrast with the Old Testament prophecies of the fruitfulness and felicity of the Messianic age, and with the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit as

mediated by the glorified Son of Man. The Holy Spirit was not yet given—'because Jesus was not yet glorified.' The main outlines of Lao-tsze's system—so far as I have been able to sketch them—are now before us. It is not difficult to see that his teaching, metaphysical, ethical, political, is all of one piece. The dominant thought is of Pure Spontaneity, the origin of all things and agent in all operations, which should also be allowed to act in the individual and in society.

As to Lao-tsze's metaphysics, I have already said all that I intended to say in the way of criticism when I suggested the contrast between Tao and God as ultimate principle. When we pass on to criticize Lao-tsze's practical teaching, the first question that occurs to one to put is this, How is there room for any practical philosophy at all? If all is from Tao, and Tao operates in all, how can we have prohibitions and commands, and obedience and disobedience? Whence comes the power that can oppose Tao and should be subject to it? How comes it that there has been a false development away from the spontaneity of Tao into vices, or even into self-conscious virtues, so that we need to cut off our sageness, wisdom, benevolence, and righteousness to attain to our true life? These are questions to which, of course, we get no answer.

If, then, it is not so that 'whatever is, is right,' we have need of some criterion of judgment and rule of living. Lao-tsze refers us to nature, for instance, to the calm indifference of Heaven and Earth, and the quietude of vegetative growth. But then again we read: 'A violent wind does not last for the whole morning: a sudden rain does not last for the whole day. To whom is it that these things are owing? To Heaven and Earth. If Heaven and Earth cannot make such spasmodic actings last long, how much less can man?' In short, not even nature perfectly exemplifies Taoistic principles. Indeed, as Wordsworth reminds us, we may find there quite other lessons than those of quietism:

> The wind, the tempest roaring high,
> The tumult of a tropic sky
> Might well be dangerous food
> For him, a youth to whom was given
> So much of earth, so much of heaven,
> And such tumultuous blood.
>
> Whatever in those climes he found
> Irregular in sight or sound,
> Did to his mind impart
> A kindred impulse; seemed allied
> To his own powers, and justified
> The workings of his heart.'

Now Lao-tsze condemns a good many of the workings of our heart, and if to fortify his opinion he refer us to the impassivity of Heaven or the quiet and self-absorbed growth of a cabbage, it seems equally open to us who feel the pulse of our tumultuous blood to appeal to the wind and the tempest roaring high. I suppose that Lao-tsze would reply, 'You imitate these phases of nature at your peril.' 'If Heaven and Earth cannot make such spasmodic actings last long, how much less can man?' 'The violent and strong do not die their natural death,' he says in another place; and adds, 'I will make this the basis of my teaching.' In short, when Lao-tsze comes to the varied aspects of nature, he selects the calm persistence of Heaven, the quiet processes of the vegetable world, the humility of water, because he finds in them embodiments of the ideals he has already got elsewhere — simplicity, quietude, lastingness. One cannot but be struck with the prominence in the *Tao Teh King* of this idea of lastingness. As we saw from the very first chapter the permanent is the real; the definite and nameable is transitory. It might be thought, then, that Lao-tsze would have no difficulty in reconciling himself to the idea of transitoriness, and we might seek this reconciliation in the not very explicit hints that he gives of a cyclical process from non-existence through definite existence back to non-existence again, along with the illustration that he apparently finds of this process in the vegetative world dying down to the root, and thence again springing up. But the human heart, even of an Eastern philosopher, is not thus satisfied. Whatever he may have thought of things, Lao-tsze desired immortality for himself. He never reconciled himself to death, or at least to the thought of ceasing to be. To the common people Death is always 'the Great Fear,' even though they were brought to accept it as their inevitable fate. But is it inevitable? Lao-tsze almost seems to have thought that it is not, at least for the sage. 'Heaven is long enduring, and Earth continues long. The reason why Heaven and Earth are able to endure and continue long is because they do not live of or for themselves. This is how they are able to continue and endure. Therefore the sage puts his own person last, and yet it is found in the foremost place: he treats his

person as if it were foreign to him, and yet that person is preserved.' Lao-tsze speaks of a strange invulnerability which the sage enjoys. 'I have heard that he who is skilful in managing the life entrusted to him for a time travels on the land without having to shun rhinoceros or tiger, and enters a host without having to avoid buffcoat or sharp weapon. The rhinoceros finds no place in him into which to thrust his horn, nor the tiger a place in which to fix his claws, nor the weapon a place to admit its point. And for what reason? Because there is in him no place of death.' At one time Lao-tsze seems to be thinking of an immortality that does not evade death, but survives it. 'He who dies and yet does not perish has longevity.' But again, by what seems a regrettable declension from philosophic levels, he gives us strange directions as to the management of the breath, by which the Taoistic state may be induced, and this physical life might be fostered, if not indefinitely prolonged. 'The Tao which originated all under the sky is to be considered as the mother of them all. When the mother is found, we know what her children should be. When one knows that he is his mother's child, and proceeds to guard the mother in him, to the end of his life he will be free from all peril. Let him keep his mouth closed, and shut up the portals of his nostrils, and all his life he will be exempt from laborious exertion.' 'When the intelligent and animal souls are held together in one embrace, they can be kept from separating. When one gives undivided attention to the breath, and brings it to the utmost degree of pliancy, he can become as a babe.' To the babe-like Taoist, again, immunity is promised—'poisonous insects will not sting him,' and so on. We may have seen an infant, ignorantly fearless, allowing a bee to crawl on his arm without being stung by it, where a nervous adult would certainly have provoked retaliation. This may be an illustration of the immunity Lao-tsze means. At any rate there seems to be some management of the breath which helps to induce the Taoistic state to which some sort of immunity and immortality is promised. However unsatisfactory and vague these references to immortality are, they as well as the later Taoism, with its pills and elixir of long life, prove that in the Far East there are those who stretch out blind hands, and to whom we can bring near the boon they are groping after, exhorting them 'to lay hold of the life eternal.' The suggestion that the promise of life, of the more abundant life which appeals to us of the strenuous West, has no attractiveness to the contemplative East, is not true of the most contemplative thinker whom China has produced.

We must remember, however, that besides lastingness or immortality, simplicity and quietude are also Lao-tsze's ideals. These are good words. We have to complain, however, that they are too much emptied of positive content. The simplicity or unity which is inculcated is like Tao itself, rather the unity of undeveloped potencies than the rich harmony of developed powers. Of course the call to 'recollection,' to gather in one's powers to their centre, 'to preserve the inner being,' is always of ethical value. But in Lao-tsze this teaching becomes too negative, and tends to the impoverishment of life. One can see, perhaps, how Lao-tsze was led to his position. He had a keen sense of the opposition between man's true nature and the kind of living that he saw around him. The evil, he protests, lies in the multifarious distractions of the will and passions. What should be regulative is the true essence of man. This is to be found in the abysmal depths—hardly of personality, rather of mere being, the residuum which Lao-tsze found when in his search for the ultimate truth of things he thought away all their qualities. And yet it would be unfair to speak as if Lao-tsze had no other message than that of abscission and suppression. Over against the negative thought of retraction from the world in order to be one's true self is the positive idea of the spontaneous outgoing of this true being. But then natural spontaneity—blind instinct—is not fitted to displace rational self-determination as a moral term.

It must be reckoned to Lao-tsze's credit, however, that his philosophy is so thoroughly a moral philosophy, with an equal emphasis on both terms. He is no speculative dilettante, but an earnest thinker whose aim is the regulation of life, and who is a *thinker* because he cannot be content with a casual collection of maxims. Here he contrasts favourably with Confucius. Confucianism tends to lose itself in externalities and formalities largely because it is a thing of regulations rather than of principles. It has indeed its theories of human nature, and its morality in a way depends on its psychology, but there does not seem to be in it any inherent necessity to fall back on what

may be discoverable of the ultimate nature of things. I wonder if I am unfair to either term of the comparison if I say that Confucianism reminds me of that intuitional theory of morals, which supposed us to be furnished by the constitution of our minds with a set of disjunct maxims, equally irreproachable and inexplicable. Now the moral philosophy of Lao-tsze has a unifying principle, and is of one piece with his metaphysics. The moral conduct he would have us exemplify is the unforced spontaneous expression of our truest being. It is more. It is the expression in us of the true life of the Universe. This teaching of Lao-tsze is therefore a welcome counterpoise to the legalism and externalism of Confucius, and has affinities with Christian Ethics if we are true to the evangelical standpoint, and look on Christian morality as the expression of 'the life of God in the soul of man.'

I would claim for Lao-tsze's teaching a religious value also. In view of Lao-tsze's attitude to the religion of his time, and the disparity between his blind and dark Tao and any idea that we would convey by the term 'God,' it may seem too bold to seek in his thinking for any religious element. But a man's religion is just his relation to that which he believes to be the ultimate. And it does seem to me that in Lao-tsze's relation to Tao we have a remarkable approach to one phase of the Christian idea of faith. Lao-tsze insists that our true life must begin in an act of self-abnegation by which we yield ourselves to Tao to act in us and through us. He does not disguise the austerity of the call he thus addresses to us. Tao is devoid of outward attraction. Its possessor and practiser is the butt of men's scorn. 'Tao as it comes from the mouth seems insipid, and has no flavour.' Speaking of himself as a lover of Tao, Lao-tsze says: 'The multitude of men look satisfied and pleased as if enjoying a full banquet, as if gazing on a spring landscape. I alone seem listless and dull. All men have their spheres of action, while I alone seem dull and incapable, like a rude borderer. I alone am different from other men, but I value the nursing mother.' 'Scholars of the highest class when they hear about Tao earnestly carry it into practice. Scholars of the middle class, when they have heard about it, seem now to keep it, and now to lose it. Scholars of the lowest class, when they have heard about it, laugh greatly at it. If it were not laughed at, it would not be fit to be the Tao.' Tao is thus outwardly unattractive. It conceals itself, and can be seen only by the pure in heart. 'He who has desires sees only the outer limit; he who has no desires sees the inner essence.' The initial step of the Taoist life, the withdrawal from the busy life of 'the wild will' and many desires, must be in some measure taken before Tao discloses itself, an act of faith in order that Tao may disclose itself. And what is true of the beginning is true all through. In one sentence, which I have already quoted, Faith is explicitly demanded. It is where Lao-tsze has been describing the happy results that would follow if a Ruler were to practise Tao, results which to the worldly-wise seem unlikely enough. 'If,' Lao-tsze says, 'the ruler has not sufficient faith in Tao, the people will not have faith in him.'

A venture of faith is called for. But he who ventures finds himself in contact with the very source of life, the universal 'nursing mother.' And there is the assurance that his faith will not be in vain. 'Heaven,' says Lao-tsze, 'is without partiality. It is always on the side of the good man.' I have not time to discuss Lao-tsze's consistency in making this allusion to Heaven. I suspect that in the light of his system Heaven cannot be more than a sort of personification of the course of events; Providence, as we loosely use that word, is perhaps our nearest equivalent. In any case, the saying indicates the optimism in the strength of which we are encouraged to have done with our restless strivings, 'to cast our deadly doings down,' and to trust ourselves to Tao in utter self-abnegation.

I omitted my introduction, and I shall not indulge in any lengthened peroration. 'The first English writer who endeavoured to give a distinct account of Taoism was the late Archdeacon Hardwick, while he held the office of Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge,' in his book entitled *Christ and other Masters*. Among these other masters Lao-tsze has his place. I cannot, indeed, use the words of a fellow-missionary, who speaks of 'the quiet peace which the study of Lao-tsze has brought' to himself, and calls himself Lao-tsze's 'disciple.' Such a profession of discipleship, if it is seriously meant, seems to me to be excluded by the words of our Lord: 'One is your master, even the Christ.' But I recognize in Lao-tsze a seeker after the truth, who in many ways has evinced the natural Christianity of the human soul. I salute him as one of those 'Scholars of the highest class,' who, if he had heard of the true Tao, would not have laughed at it, but would have earnestly carried it into practice.

The Centralization of Israel's Worship.

By Professor John E. M'Fadyen, M.A., Toronto.

When Israel invaded Canaan and began to settle upon the land, she found everywhere throughout it an idolatrous worship vigorously maintained by the older inhabitants upon the so-called high places (Dt 12^2). These were very frequently upon hill-tops (Hos 4^{13}), but the word came to be applied in a more general way to any seat of idolatrous worship; and probably every city or village had a high place of its own (2 K 17^9), in which the Baal of the district was worshipped. In her occupation of the land, nothing was more natural than that Israel should take over some of those high places and make them centres of the worship of her own national God. Von Gall (*Altisr. Kultstätten*, 1898) has enumerated nearly a hundred such centres, many of which, such as Gilgal and Beersheba (Am 5^5), were the objects of pilgrimage. The sites glorified in the stories of the patriarchs, and associated with those ancient names—Shechem with Abraham (Gn 12^7), Beersheba with Isaac (26^{33}), Bethel with Jacob (28^{19})—must have been famous seats of worship long before the invasion of Canaan by Israel; and they continued to enjoy their prestige, and to be the pride and joy of the people, at least down to the time of Amos and Hosea, in the 8th century B.C.

Of the legitimacy of these places of worship in the mind of early Israel there can be no doubt. Her leading men deliberately identify themselves with the worship that was there carried on, and even take a foremost part in it. Samuel presides over a sacrifice held in a high place (1 S 9^{12}); Solomon on a great occasion sacrifices at Gibeon (1 K 3^4); Elijah defends the cause of Israel's God at the altar on Carmel (1 K $18^{21ff.}$), and he complains bitterly that the altars at which Jahweh was worshipped had been thrown down throughout the land (1 K $19^{10.\ 14}$).

Connected, however, with the worship upon the high places were very grave dangers. The worship of Jahweh there celebrated tended to degenerate into a worship scarcely distinguishable from that of Baal. The two had, indeed, from the beginning many elements in common. Jahweh could Himself be called Baal, as many Hebrew proper names show; the association of deity with springs, trees, stones, etc., was common to both, many of Israel's shrines being admittedly connected with these things—Hebron with a tree (Gn 13^{18}), Beersheba with a well (26^{32}), Bethel with a stone (28^{18}). The sensuous rites with which the older inhabitants had celebrated the fertility of the land, could hardly help infecting the worship of Jahweh. And such we know to have been the case. Immorality was freely practised at the shrines (Am 2^7, Hos 4^{13}), and indulgence of other kinds was also rampant (Am 2^8); and these excesses not only were not restrained, but they appear to have been abetted by the priests, who sometimes even behaved with unscrupulous violence (Hos 6^9). The worship was frankly idolatrous (1 K 12^{28}, Hos 8^6 10^5), in most respects practically a Baal-worship—a shameless caricature of true Jahweh-worship; and we cannot wonder that the earlier prophets foretell the destruction of the sanctuaries at which it was practised (Am 7^9, Hos 10^8).

Less grave than these moral offences, but not unimportant, was the inadequate conception of the unity of Jahweh which the multiplicity of shrines tended to encourage. He was the one God who had given Israel the land and victory; but the various shrines, with their, no doubt, partly varying types of worship, were in danger of obscuring this unity, so that the Jahweh of Gibeon, who appeared to Solomon in a dream (1 K 3^5), might be practically conceived as a different person from the Jahweh of Hebron, to whom Absalom had vowed a vow (2 S 15^7). The purity of Jahweh-worship as practised at the shrines was in grave danger, then, from these two sources: His unity was obscured, and—what was of more practical importance—His moral demands were ignored.

A reformation was needed; and yet, in a sense, reformation was impossible. Affection for the shrines, hoary as they were with ancient traditions, and alive with happy, joyous memories, was too deeply planted in the hearts of the people to be lightly uprooted by the reforming party, especially as the land was covered from end to end with these seats of worship, and their influence, partly for good, largely for evil, spread like a network throughout the whole life of the people; and, as under

these circumstances improvement seemed impossible, the only alternative was the abolition of these places, and the centralization of the worship in one spot, where it could be controlled by those to whom its purity was dear. The way for this centralization had already been gradually prepared. A certain pre-eminence would, no doubt, from the first attach to the sanctuary in which the ark was present—*e.g.* Shiloh (1 S 3). But, after the destruction of Shiloh (cf. Jer 7^{12}), the claims of Jerusalem, as soon as the monarchy had securely established itself, would soon begin to overshadow those of other shrines—at least of the shrines of Judah; for, of course, northern Israel had famous shrines of her own, notably at Bethel and Dan (1 K 12^{29}). For one thing, Jerusalem was the capital, and the political centralization effected there would create an atmosphere in which the idea of religious centralization would begin to flourish. Besides, the temple was attached to the palace, and would gather to itself the glory associated with royalty. It was a sort of king's chapel, built on a scale so magnificent that it must have thrown all the other high places of Judah into the shade, and its sacrifices and ceremonies would be conducted on an equally splendid scale.

When the northern kingdom fell, in 721 B.C., and Judah became the real centre of Hebrew life, the importance of Jerusalem, in the religious as well as in the political aspect, must have been greatly enhanced; and the prestige already attaching to it must have been enormously increased when, twenty years later (701 B.C.), the city and temple were spared in Sennacherib's invasion of Judah, which destroyed forty-six other cities, and dealt, no doubt, a serious blow to the prestige of their high places. The belief in the inviolability of Jerusalem, encouraged by this deliverance, and doubtless also by the preaching of Isaiah, must have continued to be held with great tenacity, for a century later Jeremiah (26^{11}) finds it necessary to enter a very strenuous protest against it—a protest which nearly cost him his life. Thus everything conspired to point to Jerusalem as the true centre of Jahweh-worship, should the time ever come for its centralization. The need for that centralization we have already seen—a need created by the immorality of the sanctuaries generally, and by the imperilled unity of Jahweh; for Jahweh is one (Dt 6^{4}), and from one God it was easy to argue to one sanctuary. In the 7th century a reform programme was drawn up, and embodied in Deuteronomy in 621 B.C. The reformers at one stroke declared the worship of the shrines throughout the land as illegal, and centralized the worship at Jerusalem, which is described as 'the place which Jahweh your God shall choose' (Dt 12^{5}). From that day on—theoretically at least—Jerusalem is the place where alone Jews ought to worship (Jn 4^{20}), and in later times we hear no more of the high places. The exile of half a century in Babylon (586–537) effectually severed the people from all such associations, and in later times it was the dearest ambition of every loyal Jew of the Dispersion to visit Jerusalem and participate in the worship of the temple (Ps 84).

Practically, however, the victory was not so complete as it seemed to be. The people can hardly have witnessed the demolition of their beloved shrines without the deepest resentment, and the death of the reforming king Josiah on the battlefield (608 B.C.) gave a great impetus to the reactionaries, so that Jeremiah's complaint—whatever be its date—that the gods of Judah are as numerous as her cities (2^{28} 11^{13}), is probably nearly as applicable to the time after as before the Deuteronomic law. Many of the survivals of idolatrous and superstitious worship attested for post-exilic times (Is $57^{3ff.}$ $65^{3f.}$ 66^{17}) were probably associated with the sites of ancient high places. But in spite of such sporadic usages, the exclusive legitimacy of the worship at Jerusalem was, from the time of the return, acknowledged—at least by all loyal Jews—in practice as it had already been in theory; and the spiritual needs of those who resided at a distance from Jerusalem were met by synagogues.

For the Samaritans, however, as is well known, who formed a schismatic community in the 5th or 4th century B.C., the place of worship was Gerizim (cf. Jn 4^{20}), and this it has continued to be to this day. More remarkable, however, is it to find, in spite of the Deuteronomic law, a temple of Jahweh in Egypt erected by Egyptian Jews. According to the Elephantine papyri published by Sachau in 1907, a temple of Jahu (Jahweh) at Jeb (Elephantine) was destroyed in 411 B.C. by order of the Persian governor Waidrang, at the instigation of the priests of the Egyptian god Khnub, and the Jews appeal for its restoration to the Persian governor of Judah and the high priest. In the course of the letter they acknowledge that the

temple is at least as old as Cambyses' invasion of Egypt (525 B.C.). Even that, however, would be a century after the publication of the Deuteronomic law, enforcing centralization. Steuernagel (*S.K.*, 1909, 7 ff.) has suggested that the Jews who built this temple had gone to Egypt as auxiliaries to aid Psammetichus I. against the Ethiopians about 650 B.C. In that case they would have been unacquainted with the Deuteronomic law, and their creation of a temple would be altogether intelligible. It is also possible, if the colony should be proved to have been founded later—and it may even be earlier—that the views of the Egyptian Jews in this respect, as in some others, were more liberal than those of the motherland. We also know that a temple, modelled on that at Jerusalem, was erected by Onias IV. at Leontopolis in Egypt, about 160 B.C., where worship was regularly maintained till after the fall of the Jerusalem temple (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. iii. 1).

Literature.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

THE conflict between Religion and Science is not yet at an end; and some think that it is never like to be. But it has undoubtedly entered upon a most interesting stage of its history. There were once dogmatists in Religion who denied the right of Science to exist. St. Paul spoke of 'science falsely so called.' They said all science was falsely so called. There are now dogmatists in Science, like Haeckel and Mr. M'Cabe, who deny the right of Religion. But if Religion did not accomplish the suppression of Science in its infancy, Science will not succeed in annihilating Religion in its manhood. The new phase of the conflict is the recognition of the right of Science to exist and of Religion to exist, and the inevitable inquiry thereupon whether they can occupy adjacent territory in peace or must continue to go to war for some territory lying between them to be for ever claimed by both. One thing is certain. It will be better that the conflict should continue than that Religion should be content to claim its men of religion, leaving Science to retain its men of science.

The whole subject has been considered by Professor Émile Boutroux of the University of Paris, and he has written a book upon it, which has been translated by Mr. Jonathan Nield, under the title of *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy* (Duckworth; 8s. net). What conclusion does he come to? The first conclusion he comes to is that men of religion are no longer to be satisfied without science, and that men of science are no longer to be satisfied without religion. And that is not only the first thing, but the last. For it really does not matter, then, though Science and Religion should continue to quarrel a little about their boundary-stones. If the time should come when Germany should say to France (in the language of Mr. G. K. Chesterton), 'I need also your swiftness and experimentalism'; and France should say to Germany, 'And I need something of your slowness and reverence,' it does not follow that Alsass-Lothringen will become Alsace and Lorraine, but it will be a great step towards perfection, the perfection of individual Germany, and the perfection of individual France. The absurdity called Germany shall correct the insanity called France, and both shall be vastly the better of it.

But what will Science stand for? It will stand for the study of phenomena and for the conclusions which may be drawn from that study. And what will Religion stand for? It will stand for the interpretation of science and for the unexpected that occurs in the study of phenomena. For the unexpected does occur. Science supposes—science is built upon the supposition—that all phenomena are only the repetition of a single phenomenon. And it is so, except when the unexpected happens. 'We labour for what is uncertain,' said St. Augustine; and the saying made a great impression on Pascal. It is another way of saying, 'We live by faith.'

But this faith when it is exercised finds its object more certain than are the phenomena of Science. And then it proceeds to love. Faith, representation of an ideal, enthusiasm or love—these three make up the 'insanity' called Religion, without which the 'absurdity' called Science cannot be made perfect.

WASHINGTON GLADDEN.

Dr. Washington Gladden 'would like to be guaranteed another seventy years in just such a world as this.' And yet the seventy he has had have not kept him lying on a bed of roses. His *Recollections* (Constable; 7s. 6d. net) give a lively description of the life of a congregational minister in the United States, and it is undoubtedly very much what he calls it, 'suffering and sorrow, struggle and privation, hard knocks and tough luck.'

Washington Gladden lost his father at the age of six or seven, and his mother married again. That father's influence has been with him all the years, but it could not keep him from the hard knocks. He was sent as apprentice to a local printer; sent himself to Williams College, where he heard President Mark Hopkins ask some questions out of the 'Shorter Catechism'; and then, after a very short spell of 'schoolmastering,' he was licensed to preach the gospel. 'The certificate of licensure,' he says, 'is in Mr. Beecher's [not Henry Ward but Thomas K. Beecher's] handwriting.' The scribe of the Association, 'who was an illiterate blunderer,' had written it and handed it to the moderator to sign. He glanced at it, and suddenly said, 'What's this? "The Susquehanna Association, having examined . . . commends him to the churches of Chr"—at the end of the line, with a hyphen, "ist" at the beginning of the next line! Is Christ divided? Give me a pen and let me write a certificate that will not disgrace this body.'

Nor was the inward call more formal than the outward. At the county school he had a teacher who 'found me a listless and lazy pupil; left me with a zest for study and a firm purpose of self-improvement. It was a clear case of conversion.' There seems to have been no other. After some years Bushnell was discovered and appropriated. 'That there was a gospel to preach I had no longer any doubt.' And what was the gospel? 'Religion is nothing but friendship; friendship with God and with men.' He knows that there is such a thing as Sonship. 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.' But how shall we discover who are led by the Spirit of God? Dr. Gladden's answer is immediate: 'By their fruits: we can only find them out by looking at their lives.' And by that test Dr. Washington Gladden is a good follower of the Lord Jesus Christ.

His *Recollections* are trustworthy. There is no foolish modesty; there is no foolish self-praise. He has lived a heroic life, hating evil and suffering for his hatred. For four years he was a paid editor of the *Independent*. He left the office because certain advertisements were printed as if they were editorial matter. He left the office and had the wide world before him. But again he was called to the pulpit, and again he preached the gospel of 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.'

THE RELIGION OF THE GREEKS.

In five volumes octavo, of many pages each, and illustrated by many very fine plates, Dr. L. R. Farnell has published a great history of the Religion of the Greeks. His chosen title is *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 5 vols., 82s. 6d. net). He has not been able to accomplish all that he undertook to do. Though the originally contemplated three volumes have run to five, he has still had to leave unwritten that full account of the worship of heroes and of the dead which he purposed at the beginning. But what he has done is so well done that we are grateful. It is the best account of the Religion of Greece that has ever been written. It is such a work as a man who makes no special study of Greece or of Religion should make haste to possess. For it is one of the few works that combine the finest scientific research with the most artistic literary finish. And it will never lose its value.

The method and scope of the work were fully described after the issue of the first two volumes. With the issue of the fifth it becomes necessary to say something about the final three. But to go over the ground again would be a mistake. Let it suffice to say that the scope of the work includes the whole of the religion of Greece whether found in books or on monuments, whether seen in ritual or doctrine. And the method is to take up each cult separately, one after another. Thus the fifth volume describes the Cults of Hermes, the Cults of Dionysos, the Cults of Hestia, of Hephaistos, and of Ares; it closes with a chapter on the Minor Cults—the Nymphs, the Horai and Charites, the Eumenides, and the rest.

Dr. Farnell has spent twenty years on the work. He does not grudge it. To himself the thorough study of the Greek religion is not an end, it is a preparation. It is a preparation for the study of Comparative Religion. Twenty years ago he saw that Comparative Religion was about to be the great discipline of our time, and he resolved to prepare himself for it. He saw that the Greek religion would be the best preparation, because it reflects so vividly the higher and the lower workings of the religious sense. He therefore began a systematic study of that religion. And now his book is the best possible preparation for the study of Comparative Religion on our part. If there was one man who saw the importance of Comparative Religion twenty years ago, there are a hundred who see it now. And they see, what Dr. Farnell scarcely could have seen then, that even Comparative Religion is not a study whose end is with itself, but that it has become necessary for the defence of the truth and for the maintenance of the individual religious life and the spiritual well-being of the community.

SOME RECENT VOLUMES OF SERMONS.

There is no season in all our experience that has produced so many volumes of sermons as the publishing season of 1909–10. A number of volumes have been noticed already, a number have yet to be noticed.

The Hulsean Lectures are sermons. The lecturer for 1909–10 was the Rev. W. Edward Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc., the author of *The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, and other books. He gave his lectures, and he gives his book, the title of *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity* (Longmans; 5s. net). It is the great urgent problem of the present time. For it is not socialism that we need fear. It is socialism divorced from Christ. And then the evil of socialism would only be greater than the evil of rationalism in that the one laid captive the body; the other enslaved the mind. In unchristian socialism we might have to eat the bread of the homeless, but in unchristian rationalism (which is already on us and around us and there is no uneasiness) we are told and taught to curse God and die. Dr. Chadwick has studied his subject thoroughly. His Hulsean lectures go far beyond the ordinary volume of essays on the social problem. The author is equipped on the one hand with a thorough knowledge of Christ, and on the other with a no less thorough knowledge of social conditions.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have undertaken the publication of the Rev. W. M. Clow's volume, *The Day of the Cross*, and have issued a new edition, enlarged by the addition of five new sermons (6s.). The evangelical note is unmistakable here. It is very pronounced. How otherwise? For the whole volume is occupied with one day in the life of Jesus, and that the day of His death. How could a man be other than evangelical in that proximity?

But if it is a question of evangelicalism, the Rev. J. G. Greenhough, M.A., one of the great Baptist preachers, will stand comparison with any man. His new volume is occupied with St. Paul. But its subject, as its title, is *The Mind of Christ in St. Paul* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). In St. Paul himself Mr. Greenhough is interested only as St. Paul was interested in Christ. The book is a preacher's presentation of the mind that was in St. Paul; but the mind that was in St. Paul was always the mind of Christ, and every text which starts with psychology ends with some aspect of the Atonement.

And if Mr. Greenhough is evangelical, what shall we call Dr. Campbell Morgan? Perhaps the distinction is this. To the fact of the Cross Dr. Campbell Morgan adds the record of it. He must have the Bible as well as Christ. He is not satisfied with the authority of Christ in his own life, nor with all the evidence of Christian experience in the past. He must have the Gospels equally impervious to criticism and equally authoritative. In this little book there is no discussion of the authority of the Bible, it is simply taken for granted. It is taken although Dr. Campbell Morgan knows quite well it is not granted in the way he takes it. The title is *The Bible and the Cross* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. 6d. net).

Dr. Pearson M'Adam Muir delivered the Baird Lecture in 1909. And the Baird Lecture is delivered in a series of sermons; we may therefore take in his book here also. But there is a subject and a system throughout, and the lectures are not ordinary sermons. The subject is *Modern Substitutes for Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It recalls Flint's 'Anti-Theistic Theories'—perhaps the greatest of all the Baird Lectures.

But it is not given to Dr. M'Adam Muir to separate his substitutes for Christianity into compartments as Professor Flint did. The great difficulty of the modern apologist is that there is so much give and take, not only between Christianity and its rivals, but also among the rivals themselves. After a chapter on the 'Popular Impeachments of Christianity,' in which Mr. Blatchford's name figures freely, Dr. Muir recognizes the rise and influence of the ethical societies and deals with 'Morality without Religion.' Next follows a hunt after Pantheism, most elusive of all anti-theistic theories. Then Dr. Muir draws closer. From the religion of humanity he passes to Theism without Christ, and ends with the tribute of Criticism. It is a competent apologetic, but it will be relished most of all for the fine literary flavour that never forsakes it.

The Rev. H. O. Mackey gives himself to the honourable occupation of providing for the hungry preacher. His latest volume is unblushingly offered to 'busy people.' It is, as it is called, a volume of *Miniature Sermons* (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net). It is surprising that one can put so much interest into so little space. But it is the least of all this list. We have given it its place to punish our prejudice against skeletons.

Dr. Louis Albert Banks is the Talmage of to-day. His colours are not quite so loud as those with which Talmage delighted to work. But he has as many anecdotes to tell, and he tells them with quite as much dramatic abandonment. He has preached a long series of sermons for young people on the Book of Proverbs, and now he publishes them under the title of *The Problems of Youth* (Funk & Wagnalls; 6s.). The Book of Proverbs is very suitable for sermons to the young. It turns out to be very suitable for the kind of sermons Dr. Banks loves to preach. Here is one of the most striking and least startling of the anecdotes. In accordance with his method, Dr. Banks begins his sermon with it. 'In Baltimore one Sunday morning, as the people were going to church, a telegraph pole, large and strong and round, looking as stalwart as any other in the line, suddenly did a strange thing. Without any warning, like a great, strong man struck down by an unseen bullet, the pole groaned, and then, with a snapping, tearing, grinding sound, the upper portion fell to the street, leaving about twenty-five feet standing. The people looked on and wondered. A crowd soon gathered, marvelling at what should have caused such a catastrophe. There was no hurricane, not even a brisk breeze, and surely not enough to sever such a pole as that, which had weathered so many storms. Just then a small boy began to climb the stump that was left, to investigate. When he reached the top, he found that right where the pole had broken was a scooped-out place where a pair of woodpeckers had cut out their nest, and there in the nest was a poor little woodpecker, frightened half to death. Unnoticed, but steadily, stroke after stroke, the birds had dug their way back into the heart of the great strong telegraph-pole, until they had sapped its strength.'

Canon Hensley Henson has included three sermons in the volume containing his Yale Lectures on Preaching, which allows us to take his volume into the present survey. The great difficulty which all the recent Yale Lecturers have had to contend with is the difficulty of finding something to say about preaching that has not been said at Yale already. But Canon Henson could not say what any one else had already said though he tried it. He deliberately does try to say what has been said, not by a Yale Lecturer, but by a Puritan poet. He calls his book *The Liberty of Prophesying* (Macmillan; 6s.), for the very purpose of saying that he is recovering and repeating Milton. But he is still himself, very individual and very modern. There never lived a man who made a greater resolve to speak the truth, as he understood it, to his own generation. Few men have lived who have suffered more for doing it. Canon Henson finds it very difficult to preach to-day. He gives five reasons for the difficulty—change of social custom in the matter of religious observance; fluidity of modern populations implying the failure of the old local conditions; brevity of modern sermons; free discussion of sacred subjects in the secular press; the baleful influence of the so-called religious newspapers, 'themselves the creatures and instruments of religious partizanship.' The last is not the least. What does he say about it? 'The preacher,' he says, 'who would criticize conventional beliefs, and pursue a course adverse to the prevailing policy of his church, must sustain the opposition of the religious, that is, of the party, press. His words will be torn from their context; distorted into senses which were foreign to his mind; paraded before an excited and

ignorant public without any of the reservations with which he had conditioned them. His explanations will be ignored: he may count himself fortunate if his personal character is not maligned. One of the gravest facts of our time is the power for evil of the "religious" press.'

If any preacher is in want of suggestions for a series of sermons, he will find them in *Trial and Triumph*, by the Rev. G. Arthur Sowter, M.A. (Nisbet; 3s. 6d. net). There is first a course on the great experiences—Sin, Repentance, Faith, Confession, Temptation, Prayer, Fasting. There is next a course on the great disciplines—Temptation, Toil, Disappointment, Loneliness, Failure, Suffering. Then there is a course on the relation of our Lord to death—Christ foretelling Death, Christ praying before Death, and so on. And last of all there are three Eastertide messages—'the Risen Lord,' 'the First and the Last,' and 'Hope, Riches, Power.'

The three sermons which Dr. John Kelman has published in *The Courts of the Temple* (Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier; 1s. net) have distinction enough to demand a place in this survey, though they are so few and the volume is so unassuming. One sermon is on Art and Religion, one on Commerce and Religion, and one on Industry and Religion. It is Glasgow that has the motto, 'Let Glasgow flourish by the preaching of the Word.' But the preaching of the Word has done more to make Edinburgh what it is than any other single influence. And this is the preaching that has done it. It is eminently suitable to such a city, with its variety of interest, with its acceptance of the intellect in everything. But it is also eminently faithful to the simplicity which is in Christ.

What is this new enterprise of the Rev. J. Henry Burn, B.D.? He calls it *The Churchman's Pulpit* (Griffiths). It is to be published in weekly parts, at 1s. 6d. net each; and occasionally there are to be double parts at 3s. 6d. net, and special parts at 5s. net. The page is a very large octavo, very closely printed, so that each part has plenty of matter for the money. But what are the sermons? New or old? Complete or condensed? Some are surely new, and some are certainly old; and it is probable that the new are complete, and the old condensed. Thus we have F. W. Robertson—unless Mr. Burn has discovered a manuscript in a red box. But there is also the Rev. T. T. Carter with six eloquent sermons on the Imitation of Christ; and there is the late Dr. Frederick Field, the great Old Testament scholar, to whose manuscripts we know that Mr. Burn has the special privilege of access. Well, it is a most promising undertaking. Mr. Burn does nothing without doing it well.

We have left two outstanding volumes of Methodist sermons to the last.

The Rev. Thomas G. Selby is a master in the art of making sermons. And it seems as if every sermon he made were fit for publishing. He has published many volumes, but never a better than this. Its title is *The Divine Craftsman* (Culley; 3s. 6d.). The sermon that has attracted us most we have found in the very middle of the book. Its text is 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant' (Ps 25^{14}). It is the subject of all subjects that seems to need most emphasis now. It is the Psalmist's way of saying that only the pure in heart shall see God. There is a radius, says Mr. Selby, within which God is at home. And he adds this illustration: 'The note of the nightingale is heard within fixed geographical frontiers. It never sings north of York, or west of the river Exe. Its eggs have been hatched under other birds in both Scotland and Wales, but the fledglings, after taking their departure, never return in the following spring to make midnight music. And the sweet notes which whisper the love of the Eternal Friend are only heard within strict ethical frontiers.'

Dr. J. Scott Lidgett's volume is called Sermons and Addresses, and it is more addresses than sermons. Most of its contents, he says, 'were strictly official utterances delivered by me as President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference.' He seems to think he may be challenged for publishing discourses which have been delivered on different occasions. His reply is that they fit together and form a connected whole. 'They are an attempt to show the inclusiveness of the spiritual life and to set forth the way in which many great causes which appeal to Christians in the present day, notably Evangelism, Foreign Missions, Social Reform, and Christian Reunion, are related to Faith in Christ and to the service of His Kingdom.' Among the rest there is a thoroughly wholesome address on Holiness. It was delivered at the Southport Holiness Convention in July 1909. It is a model of exegetical accuracy for the

use of all Convention speakers. The title of the book is *Apostolic Ministry* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net).

The Fascinating Study of Religion.

'We need constantly to remind ourselves that although life *has* its pleasures, it *is* a serious business, and that if there are many subjects we *may* study, there are some we *must* study if we are to live successfully.' So says the Rev. H. Montague Dale, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Summerfield, Birmingham. And then he says that the first of all the subjects which we must study is Comparative Religion. Religion, he says, demands our study because of its prevalence, persistence, and power. But what is to be our method of study? 'The comparative method has proved so valuable in the sciences, that it may be said that they became truly scientific through the application of that method. For example, anatomy became a real science when a comparison of structures was commenced. And if there is to be a true science of religion, it must be through the employment of that method which "recognizes, when it sees begin in the leaf, the structural plan or purpose which finds its culmination in the glorious form and moving image of man."'

We congratulate Mr. Dale on his insight. Some of his brethren cannot see it yet. They think it safer to confine themselves to Christianity. Mr. Dale has written a most agreeable introduction to the study of Religion, under the title of *Religion: Its Place and Power* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net).

A New Synopticon.

Mr. J. M. Thompson, whose book entitled *Jesus according to St. Mark* has already given him a good introduction, has now arranged the Synoptic Gospels in parallel columns after the manner of Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*. Mr. Thompson, however, is Revised Version, while Rushbrooke is original Greek. First, he prints St. Mark consecutively, in paragraphs, and in parallel columns the corresponding passages in St. Matthew and in St. Luke. Next, he prints St. Matthew and St. Luke where they are independent of St. Mark and parallel. And last of all, he prints in parallel columns all the matter that is still left over. The whole work is most workmanlike, editor, printer, and publisher having co-operated harmoniously. The title is simply *The Synoptic Gospels* (Clarendon Press; 7s. 6d. net).

Historical and Linguistic Studies.

The University of Chicago continues the issue of its series of 'Historical and Linguistic Studies in the Literature of the New Testament.' Dr. C. K. Staudt has written a monograph on *The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period* (54 cents); and Dr. J. C. Granbery has written *An Outline of New Testament Christology* (56 cents).

The British School at Athens.

Messrs. Macmillan have published the fourteenth yearly volume of *The Annual of the British School at Athens* (25s. net). It covers the work done during the session 1907 to 1908.

If it were not inconvenient to play hide-and-seek with the title of a society, the British School at Athens should in 1908 have been called the British School at Sparta. For at Sparta its work was done. Work began on the 23rd of March, and lasted till the end of May. The greater part of that time was occupied with the excavation of the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia. The staff consisted of the Director (Mr. R. M. Dawkins, of Emmanuel College, Cambridge) and six assistants. One of the assistants, however, Mr. Dickins, completed the excavation of the site of the Hieron of Athena Chalkioikos, which he had begun the year before, while Mr. Woodward searched for inscriptions.

The results were not sensational. At least, there was no single sensational result. But no one can go through this volume, with its mass of matter and its multitude of illustrations, without seeing that the whole result of the season's work is quite impressive.

But the British School at Athens renders a higher service than can be expressed by material results. At the annual meeting of the subscribers the chair was taken and the address delivered by Lord Cromer. It must have been a surprise to the subscribers present to hear Lord Cromer argue against specialization. It must have been with difficulty that they smiled when he told this story: 'Some twenty-five years ago, when the Government of Mr. Gladstone decided not to maintain Egyptian authority in the Soudan, I received a visit from a gentleman of high scientific attainments who had devoted most of his very useful life to the study of botany. He was very indignant with the British Government, and his indignation was, to a great extent, based on the fact, that one of the most remote of the districts

which were about to lapse into unredeemed barbarism was the only spot on the earth which produced a certain species of trefoil.'

What, then, is the service which the British School at Athens renders? It teaches men that education is something more than preparation for obtaining immediate results. It develops, says Lord Cromer, that Megalopsuchia which is so essential to youths who are destined to take their share in the government and administration of an Empire that is world wide. And lest any one should think that this greatness of soul is akin to 'swollen head,' 'Let me remark,' says Lord Cromer—'in case I should be misunderstood by any who are not amongst my present audience, and who may perhaps think that I am advocating some novel and objectionably aggressive form of Imperialism—that Megalopsuchia, which is admirable, is not in any way to be confounded with Megalomania, which is altogether detestable.'

For the Work of the Ministry.

The objection to the Yale Lectures on Preaching, of which the latest volume is among the books of the month, is that they are occupied with only one aspect of our high calling. That is because they belong to a series. Every new lecturer feels that he must break new ground. The Rev. W. H. Harrowes, M.A., Minister of St. Enoch's United Free Church, Glasgow, has omitted nothing in his volume entitled *The Minister and his Work* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net). He has omitted nothing, and he is sane and sensible on everything. The Yale lecturer recognizes that he must be brilliant, so many brilliant lecturers having preceded him. Mr. Harrowes is under no such compulsion. He is evidently determined to be good, and let who will be clever—good as a minister, and good as an educator of other ministers. There is one chapter of his book to which we have been specially drawn. It is the chapter on 'Public Prayer.' Mr. Harrowes writes for those who have to learn to pray in public. How well he writes; how evidently out of a hard and probably humiliating experience. After all, this *is* brilliance.

The Papal Conquest.

Dr. Alexander Robertson of Venice is the uncompromising foe of the Pope of Rome and all that the Pope of Rome stands for. To his new book he has given the title of *The Papal Conquest* (Morgan & Scott; 6s.). Its sub-title is 'Italy's Warning—Wake Up, John Bull!' For the book is addressed not to Italians, but to Englishmen. The papal conquest is the conquest of England. Dr. Robertson believes that 'this Roman Catholic organization—"wickedly miscalled a Church," to use again the words of *Punch*—is of this world, is only a political institution aiming at temporal wealth and power'; and that therefore, in every country where it exists, it is the enemy of that country. 'This,' he says, 'is a matter of history, and a matter of everyday observation and fact.' Now he holds that England alone blocks the way to the recovery of the temporal dominion of the Church, and that the Roman Curia is now working as it never worked before for the conquest and humiliation of England. The book is written with tremendous energy, and it is illustrated in the most startling fashion by cartoons taken from the *Asino*—'a paper,' says Dr. Robertson, 'which exists in Italy for the express purpose of vindicating Christ and Christianity from the vile caricature of both presented by the Papal Church.'

History, Authority, and Theology.

The Principal of King's College is an ecclesiastical theologian. He is not a theologian pure and simple. He is greatly interested in theology; but theology is not his chief interest. Its place is in his head, it does not hold his heart. And *pectus facit theologum*. Nor is he a historian pure and simple. He is interested in history, but it is the history of the Church. And it is the history of the Church, not with the detachment of a scientific historian, but with the attachment of a defender of the Church of England.

Dr. Headlam believes heartily in the Church of England. Let us listen to him. 'The present writer,' he says, 'starts from a natural *praejudicium* which is created by being a member of the English Church. He no more approaches the question with an open mind than a member of the Roman or of the Nonconformist bodies. But it has been his duty to investigate for himself the authority and the status of the Church to which he belongs. It is a confession which at the present day it may be very unfashionable to make, that the result of his investigations has been to strengthen his conviction that the Church of England is an adequate though not infallible representative of the Christian society, and in particular that the logical position

on which the Church rests is sound. It is the custom to believe that the English Church is the creation of political compromise. That position I believe to be entirely untrue. The principle of the English Church is that its standard of truth is the Old and the New Testaments as interpreted by Christian history and tradition. The actual process pursued at the English Reformation was not to attempt to re-construct the Church anew from the beginning, but to cut away such mediæval abuses and accretions as had been shown to be without authority and harmful. In both cases the principle seems to my mind absolutely sound. The method of reform was the right one, and the result, historical continuity combined with adaptation to the needs of the day, represents the combination of the two principles of government which are most essential to the well-being of a nation and of a church.'

The volume, of which the title is *History, Authority, and Theology* (Murray; 6s. net), consists of an introductory essay from which the quotation has been taken, and seven other essays, all of them dealing with theology in some relation or other to the Church of England. Even the essay on the New Theology has that reference, and it is the clearer and more convincing for having it.

Switzerland of the Swiss.

Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons are the publishers of a series of volumes which look like, but must not be mistaken for, guide-books. We have already reviewed *Italy of the Italians*. The new volume is *Switzerland of the Swiss* (6s. net). Whether the ordinary guide-book is a necessary addition to one's luggage or not may be a matter of dispute; the particular volume of this series is not necessary. But that is simply because it must be mastered before one begins the journey. It is not well fitted for reading by the way; its seriousness is too sustained. But if it is read beforehand, twice over if possible, the most ordinary Briton may travel in Switzerland, or whatever the country may be, with confidence and with steadily increasing advantage. Geography, history, politics, art, religion—everything is here, and everything is in reliable order. The illustrations may be found elsewhere, but better illustrations will not be found.

Judaism.

The Rev. Morris Joseph has revised his book on *Judaism as Creed and Life*, and had it reset. The second edition, therefore, supersedes the first, and yet it is much cheaper (Routledge; 3s. 6d.).

Ancient Manuscripts.

Mr. Elliot Stock has published a Guide to the Reading of Ancient Manuscripts, under the title of *How to Decipher and Study Old Documents* (5s. net). It is a beginner's book. Much of it could be discovered by the beginner himself, and it would be better for him to discover it. But it proceeds to deeper things and more difficult. The chapter on 'Law Technicalities' is useful, and it would have been more useful if there had been more of it. For the greatest difficulty to the understanding of the 'Family Deed Chest' is not their handwriting, but the technical law language in which the deeds are drawn up.

Directories and Year-Books.

Messrs. Nisbet have published their *Church Directory and Almanack* for 1910 (2s. net). It is such a miracle of reliability and inexpensiveness that we wonder who continues to buy the dearer directories.

The *Church Pulpit Year-Book* (2s. net) is enlarged by sixteen pages, these pages being devoted to a series of addresses for men. It is, so far as we know, the first time that the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon has been recognized, either officially or semi-officially. In our judgment this will be the most popular part of the book.

The *Church of Scotland Year-Book* is ideally edited by the Rev. William Simpson of Bonhill. The volume for 1910 differs from the volume for 1909 in the number of the year, and in other figures. And no doubt there are new names that take the place of the old who will never be seen in the Year-Book again. But it is the same book. It is published by Messrs. R. & R. Clark (6d.).

The Scottish Church and University Almanac (Macniven & Wallace; 1s. net) is as indispensable to a Scottish minister as a Dictionary of the Bible.

What is a Christian?

By the Rev. G. A. Johnston Ross, M.A., Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.

There is a stage in the religious interest when there is a peculiar fascination in the definition of what precisely constitutes religion in the individual: this paper is an attempt, if not at definition, at least at description of what constitutes personal religion in Christian men. I well remember the expectant interest with which I went in my student days to St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, to hear Dr. Marcus Dods preach on 'What is a Christian?' I cannot now remember much of the sermon, but I do very vividly recall the reason for one's eager interest. In the preaching (at least the evangelistic preaching) of those days a very sharp distinction was drawn between those who are in the Kingdom and those who are without; and some of us young people (for whom it was hardly possible in the immaturity of our knowledge of life to feel that we had fully yielded to the vaguely conceived claims of God)—some of us went daily haunted by misgivings as to whether we really had or had not been 'received into the fold of Christ.' What precisely constituted a Christian,—what (I mean) in belief or surrender or personal habit or attitude,—was of vital interest to us. In the matter of these misgivings and anxieties the present generation is frankly a puzzle to me: I cannot make out how far such anxieties exist,—they are so veiled in 'theological difficulties' or by light-hearted demeanour. But I do not think there is less need than there used to be to arrive at a true idea of the essential contents of Christianhood. Let us try to get at the heart of the matter without technical language, and by way of description.

I take it, then, that in the broadest sense, the religious man is he who feels and owns the pressure of the moral and spiritual ideal upon him, and is endeavouring in some fashion to pay heed and respond to the pressure; and that the personal religion is *Christian* when the Ideal is conceived as Jesus Christ would have us conceive it. Now it is not difficult, I think, to recognize Jesus Christ's interpretation of the Ideal, at least in its main emphases. To begin with, that Ideal which from outside the visible order (in which we struggle for bread, for knowledge, for wealth, for recognition) makes itself felt within us as a moral Pressure and Summons—this Jesus declared to be the presence of a Personal Being, to be identified with the Eternal Fount and Origin of our life and with what we call Providence. This Person works within us as Mind conveying His meaning to our minds in rational but uniquely intimate ways. That 'God' is *personal* as Father, and that He is *intimate* as Spirit, these together make the first of Christ's emphases in His interpretation of the moral and spiritual Summons we hear within us. Next, Jesus taught the all-embracing power of this spiritual Person whom we hear within. I do not know whether Jesus was a 'monist' or not: He certainly treated evil as a grim reality; but I am sure He so believed in the supremacy of God and in the universality of His interest as to hold firmly *the potential unity of all persons in Him.* Next, Jesus taught that this spiritual Presence is holy—holy beyond our thought; and, finally,—with most emphasis of all,—He taught that an unaltering Love dwells at the heart of this Urgency that is upon us, and that it is Love-in-sacrifice.

Now let us return to our question, 'What is a Christian?' It is obvious that if a Christian is one who endeavours to respond to the ideal *as Jesus conceived it*, we have in these 'emphases' of Jesus the leading 'notes' of the Christian life—Spiritual Personality, Unity, Infinite Holiness, and Love-in-sacrifice: these are the brief summaries of the Christian's distinctive aspirations.

Let me try in a sentence or two to make this clear. First, to the man who accepts Christ's rendering of the facts of the moral life, there is at the centre of his life, as its most sacred experience, a personal relationship of august obligations, and a personal spiritual action welcomed and valued above all else. Now to such a man, *persons will mean more than things*, and spiritual values more than material values. He will judge that a man's life consists not in what he possesses, but in the spirit which possesses him. The character of those he loves; loyalties in friendship; the maintenance in public and domestic life of clean motive and untarnished honour,—in a word, all that exalts the spiritual in personal life will interest and attract him most. Next, if Christ's emphasis on the

comprehensiveness of God's sphere of influence and on the potential unity of all persons in Him has laid hold of a man, *the expansion of that man's sympathy* is inevitable,—the passion for unity, the dread and hate of the exclusive spirit, will certainly take hold of him. He will become, as St. Ignatius, writing to the Philadelphians described himself, 'a man knit together for unity.' Again, the emphasis on the exalted height of God's holiness means for the Christian *infinitude of aspiration and infinitude of duty*. This is the basal paradox of the Christian life: it is haunted by the infinite,—by that which in the field of striving combines the stimulating and the hopeless. 'We are saved in hope.' And then, lastly, the emphasis on Love-in-sacrifice produces the most characteristic note of the Christian life,—it is *in love with sacrifice*. Christ taught that God's very life is love,—that He *is* Himself because He *gives* Himself: and the paradox is reproduced in the Christian. Only, that which God wholly is, the Christian only partly is. He knows that fullest life is in self-giving; but the spirit of self-indulgence struggles with the spirit of self-offering. And it is because of this inner contradiction and conflict that the attitude of 'dependence on Christ' is forced upon the Christian. One moment aspiring toward the infinite, the next yielding to self-indulging ease, he needs to cast himself on One who, being otherwise one with him, yet represents in permanence that which in him is but fugitive and intermittent. So the Christian escapes from himself in Christ. And if any one say that this is unreal, the Christian man answers, 'But what else can I do? I hear the summons of the infinitely holy God to be like Himself, and I astir to respond. But the weight dragging me back seems as great as the power that calls me to rise. I can do naught else than take refuge from the conflict in God Himself!'

I do not see, then, how the essentials of Christian personal religion can be reduced much further than to these four elements, with their discipline, their contradictions, their promise, and their present issue in the attitude of 'sheltering in Christ' of which our fathers had so much to say.

But I wonder how far that attitude of escape in Christ—how far the confessed paradox of being now alone with the Supreme, and now flying for refuge to a Mediator—is in our day experienced?

In the Study.

The Depreciation of the Priceless.

'It might have been sold' (Mk 14^5).

THE suggestion came from Judas. That was all he could find to say about the precious ointment poured forth from its alabaster vase in the service of love.

The picture is before us—the Bethany circle uniting to do honour to Jesus. The Master is in the place of honour. The disciples are near. Martha is waiting at table. Lazarus looks out on things with the light of his second life in his eyes. Mary, with the inner vision of a loving heart, reads in the Master's face a shadow of things to come. There is a hush in the talking. Mary kneels at the Master's feet; the vase is broken; the perfume floats through the room. A silence follows, a silence in which love eternal is trying to say something to each man's heart. Then, as is often the case in life, the first man to break the silence is the man to whom the silence has said nothing. 'It might have been sold.'

It was bad taste, we say. Judas mishandled a beautiful situation. Judas took a business view of the scene, when he ought to have looked at it artistically.

It was more than bad taste. The real charge against Judas is, not that he took a business view, but that he got no view at all. If he sinned against art, it was not art as it is interpreted by the æsthetic temperament, with its not seldom false and uncatholic view of a workaday world, with its profound conviction that a man who paints pictures must be altogether superior to a man who makes boots—it was against art as it stands for the unpurchasable and imperishable and eternal—and that is the fabric of man's true life. That little pale-faced mite who stopped you in the street yesterday as you were carrying home a bunch of flowers to your wife, and said, 'Give me

a flower,' was not a beggar. She was an artist. It was her response to the vision beautiful, her plea for the priceless. It was a voice confessing amid the rattle of the street that 'man doth not live by bread alone.'

Judas was not a worse man for keeping the bag. Some one must keep it. The pity of it was that Judas had come to believe that the bag could keep him. It is a peril against which we too must be on our guard—not specifically as business men, for this is not essentially a peril of the market-place. It is the danger of becoming lost in the temporalities, earth-fed and earth-filled. Only a shallow and unspiritual judgment will think less of Judas for knowing the selling-price of alabaster and nard. His sin lay in that he had lost the power to see in these things a sacrament of 'the life that is life indeed.'

Do we say that his suggestion is right 'so far as it goes'? That the ointment *could* have been sold, and the money *could* have been spent on the poor? It is no vindication. A thing has to go a certain distance before it begins to be true. It has to touch the spiritual and eternal in life. And Judas missed that. And so this man, with his market price and his mental arithmetic, was not an intruder—he was an outsider.

O these priceless things—how we miss them. How Jesus pleaded for them. Judas had companied with that unworldly life, had heard the Master say that the widow's farthing was worth more than the jewels of the rich, and yet he had not learned that there are things which cannot be bought and sold. You can buy a book of poems, but you cannot buy a poem. The poem is yours only as the unpurchasable gift of God to your soul. You cannot buy a home, a happy hour, a good conscience, or a rich hope. It is worth telling again, for it is the doctrine of grace—God's mercy for the undeserving, His treasure for the poor, His fulness for the empty.

'It might have been sold.'

'That is, I think, the most vulgar remark on record. How that wonder of love in Simon's house was cheapened for the man from Iscarioth! How the shadow of a material judgment obscured for him the spiritual dignity and glory of Mary's service! Judas did not know what he was dealing with. He may have been an authority on spikenard. Perhaps he could have told us the precise meaning of that strange word *pistikes*, which St. Mark used to describe the ointment, and which bids fair to remain one of the minor puzzles of his Gospel. But he was not dealing with alabaster and spikenard. And, my friends, we never are. Life is made up of things that defy all valuation by this world's standard—things the worth of which can only be expressed in that mystic coinage that is stamped with the image of One wearing a crown of thorns, and has for its superscription, "Ye did it unto Me."'

And now, let us follow Judas from Simon's house to the house of his Master's enemies. We must do this. We cannot deal with the three hundred pence and say nothing about the thirty pieces of silver, for they are part of the same calculation. The man who cannot see the priceless is quite capable of selling it. That is the logic of history. That is the tragedy of materialism.

This 'study' comes from a volume of sermons entitled *The Pilgrim Church* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net). The sermons were preached by the Rev. Percy Clough Ainsworth, who died on the first day of July 1909 at the age of thirty-six. And there is not a sermon in the book but could be made a study of—as fertile, as felicitous as this.

The Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit.

Three of the books of the month deal with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Principal Adeney has written a beginner's book on *The Christian Conception of God* (Thomas Law; 2s. 6d. net). It is a beginner's book; but it is not the book of a beginner. Only a man of Dr. Adeney's knowledge could write so simply. Only a man of Dr. Adeney's experience could write so humbly. The chapter on the Holy Spirit is itself unmistakable evidence of the Spirit's grace and power.

'The idea of the Holy Spirit,' says Dr. Adeney, 'is entirely a Biblical and more especially a New Testament idea in its origin and authority.' Yet he does not mean to say that God's Spirit has not been felt influencing any men and women except Jews and Christians. Surely, he says, 'the impartial Father of all must be believed to have breathed His helping Spirit into His human family of all races and in all ages in so far as the several peoples were able to receive the heavenly gift.

When Socrates speaks of the spirit that he calls a *daimonion* as a voice within him to warn him against a wrong course, the Christian may say that this was as truly an influence of God's Holy Spirit as that experienced by St. Paul when, as St. Luke tells us, he was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost" to take a certain course that he was contemplating.'

But our purpose at present is to say something about the Spirit in the Old Testament, and for that we shall pass to another book.

The Rev. John Adams, B.D., of Inverkeillor, has already written 'Studies in the Hebrew Accents' and 'Studies in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament,' two remarkable books which show men the way to find sermons in the syntax and in the accents of the Old Testament Hebrew. Both books have been successful. Mr. Adams has now published another volume of Studies—this time 'Studies in Old Testament Theology.' His title is *Israel's Ideal* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net).

The book is a surprise—unless one's faculty of surprise has already been exhausted by the wonder of the volumes on the Syntax and the Accents. It is a surprise to discover that a comparatively small volume on the Theology of the Old Testament can be complete and clear, and at the same time can offer the preacher almost innumerable points for the fresh presentation of the Gospel as it is found in the Old Testament. But our purpose at present is to look at one chapter of the book, the chapter on the Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit.

Mr. Adams, being a preacher as well as a scholar, divides his chapter into three parts. First he speaks of the Cosmical Spirit, next of the Theocratic Spirit, and then of the Spirit in Regeneration. That division covers the whole Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit; and we do not know a clearer or a better division. Mr. Adams is a student of Comparative Religion. Describing the cosmical spirit, he draws his analogies and illustrations from the Ojibways, from the Eastern Africans, from Aristotle and Plutarch, or from the modern Mongols. We cannot understand the very beginnings of the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit without some study of the general subject of Animism.

Mr. Adams summarizes the Old Testament description of the Cosmical Spirit. First, it is the principle of *animation*. The chief texts are Gn 1^{2}, Ps 33^{6}, Is 40^{13}. Next, it is the principle of *intelligence* in man. 'God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul'—Gn 2^{7}; also Job 33^{4} 32^{8}. Finally, it leads into the sphere of *ethics*. The chief text is Ps 104^{30}; then Ps 51^{11} and Ps 16^{7}. In the last the voice of God is recognized even in the dictates of the conscience.

We pass from the Cosmical Spirit to the Theocratic when the *Ruach Elohim* becomes the *Ruach Yahweh*. 'If the former be the principle of animation, the latter is the spirit of revelation. If the one finds its sphere of operation in the creation and preservation of the world, the other is the spirit and guide of the theocracy.' This section is throughout admirable, but does not admit of condensation.

The third division is the Spirit in Regeneration. Mr. Adams does not find that regeneration by the Spirit is taught in the Old Testament as a clearly defined doctrine, although it is experienced as a spiritual fact. He makes this distinction amongst others, that in the Old Testament it is an influence exerted *upon* the soul, not a dwelling of the Divine Spirit *within* the soul. Again, he says, the *Ruach Yahweh* is associated with the bestowal of moral qualities, but not yet regarded as the source of holiness in man. He ends by showing that in three respects the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit looks to the New for its completion and crown—with respect to the Spirit's *personality*, with respect to the *recipients* of the Spirit's influence, with respect to the nature of the Spirit's *work*.

The third book is occupied entirely with the doctrine of the Spirit. It is the first attempt that has been made to present in English a complete account of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in touch with modern scholarship. The author is the Rev. Arthur Cleveland Downer, M.A., D.D., of Brasenose College, Oxford. The title is *The Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net).

It is, we say, a complete account of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. And it is only when we read a complete account of the doctrine that we understand why there has been so much misapprehension among us, and so much mistaken and even mischievous writing, about the Holy Spirit. Why this doctrine more than any other should be presented to us in fragments it is not easy to explain. It is just possible that every man inter-

prets his own experience and in interpreting it by itself regards it out of proportion. But the result has been to make the impression that a consistent doctrine of the Holy Spirit is not to be found in Scripture, and, which is still worse, that such fragments of a doctrine as are to be found there do not agree with our experience.

Dr. Downer has written on the whole subject within reasonable compass, with a fine command of the English language, as well as with a thorough modern knowledge of the doctrine and of all that is essential in its vast literature. His book, with all its modesty, will be found to be indispensable.

The chapter on the Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit is shorter than the chapter in Mr. Adams's book. Like Mr. Adams, Dr. Downer starts with the Spirit as the Giver of life. He is the Giver of life (1) in Nature, (2) in man, (3) in grace, (4) in the Jewish nation, and (5) in the predicted Messiah. Thus the method is different from that of Mr. Adams; but there is no contradiction. As the Giver of life in man the Spirit of God makes His voice heard (*a*) in Conscience, (*b*) through the Prophets, (*c*) in the Law, (*d*) in the Types, (*e*) in the Great Lyric, and (*f*) in various Old Testament Characters. Dr. Downer is at one with Mr. Adams in representing the Holy Spirit's work of grace as foreshadowed in the Old Testament but fulfilled only in the New. And it is not simply that a fuller revelation came in with Christ, but that Christ Himself was the fuller revelation; and again, not in what He said or did but in what He was—in short, that He was Himself the abode of the Spirit.

The Aristocratic Element in Religion.

By the Rev. W. R. Thomson, B.D., Glasgow.

'The method of God is aristocratic,' says Mr. Joseph Leckie, in a timely and very interesting little book[1] on a subject whose pressure is always felt in an age of religious unrest. The raising of the question of Authority—its reality, source, and organ—is not necessarily a sign of scepticism. It may be a symbol of genuine religious interest and an effort of faith to justify its own certainties. There is, perhaps, no subject in regard to which the spirit of treatment counts for so much. It is here Mr. Leckie achieves real distinction. His work has not only literary merit of a high order, it comes to us out of an atmosphere of quietness. It may be said of this little book that it neither strives nor cries, that, while sensitive to all that is going on in the theological arena, it dwells in a region where the jangle of polemics is at least softened by distance. Too often the discussion of authority has been the attempt to pull down—with but scant regard for the sanctities of time and custom—the fabrics under which other men have sheltered. Mr. Leckie chooses, to our mind, a better way. For it is well to recognize that there is something at once inevitable and yet provisional in the shelters men rear for their spiritual security. The canopy of Church or Bible is only an evil when it is mistaken for the heavens.

The question of authority is only really relevant in a universe that is conceived to be intelligible, and that has at its heart ethical purposiveness. There can, in other words, only be authority to which a free spirit can be in bondage in a world where God is. In a universe construed in accord with the creed of naturalism, the question is hardly intelligible. For authority to be truly from within must be from above; and if there is nothing above man, there can be nothing but the coercion of force, or at the best a prudent regard for conventions which are more or less skilful makeshifts. No one has shown this more strikingly than Mr. Balfour in the earlier and critical part of his *Foundations of Belief*, where it is pointed out that neither the intuitions of art nor religion are explicable in a world where the spirit of beauty and goodness is but a chance product and not enthroned as a regal principle. It may be doubted, indeed, whether what is known as spiritual Monism admits of any satisfactory explanation of the fact of authority. Only a personality can recognize and yield to authority in the true sense of the word, and an authority which is held to be that of a divine principle to which we hesitate

[1] *Authority in Religion.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

to ascribe personality is, after all is said, something less than man. It may offer a fascinating problem to the intellect; whether it can constrain the will and touch the emotions to high issues is another matter. Hence Mr. Leckie frankly declines to discuss authority except on the assumption of Theism. The correspondences which man's spiritual life maintains with its environment are in essence of the nature of personal intercourse. However great may be the theoretic difficulties which confront the theistic view, the fact remains that the ecstasies of the artist and the construction of the philosopher, no less than the ardours of the prophet and the raptures of the saint, are personal responses to visions of beauty, truth, and goodness, which have only significance in the realm of personal life. In the simple language of religion, authority is God's power over the soul, to awaken faith and to constrain conduct. It is, from another point of view, the soul finding the universe 'convincing'—to make use of a too frequently used word—and conviction is always a personal experience.

Authority must primarily be mediated through persons. It is here that the aristocratic element in religion is revealed. It is only in a derivative sense that an institution or a book or an official can be the organ of authority. God's greatest words are spoken through elect lives. God and the soul are face to face, and the condition of authority is communion. While this assertion carries with it the denial of an infallible Church or an infallible Scripture, it does not really detract from the authority of the Church as the home of elect souls, or from the sanctity of Scripture as the record of their utterances. Nor does it deny the validity of what may be called the democratic element in the Church. For the common consciousness of the Church gathers within itself and retains, though it may be in earthen vessels, the treasure lavished on it by prophets and saints. It may be said, indeed, that to regard the soul as the supreme organ of authority in religion is to take up dangerously subjective ground. Do we not require something more stable and abiding than an inward experience? But what is a Church or a Bible but just an embodiment of this inward thing, a vesture that clothes it more or less adequately, and derives all its worth from the life it reveals? Mr. Leckie quotes a striking saying of the late R. H. Hutton: 'That Christianity which alone can conquer the earth will be a faith neither so entirely rooted in mind and spiritual emotion as that of Luther, nor so studiously reflected in secondary organs and external institutions as that of Rome.' That is to say, we are warned against subjectivism on the one hand, and institutionalism on the other. But the subjective is soon corrected in the large world of spiritual life. Souls try souls, and experience tests all. The only thing that is more striking than the loneliness of a great soul is its capacity for communion and its power to inspire it, its power to enrich—one had almost said, to create—a common life that nourishes countless spirits. No man, and least of all the aristocrat in religion, lives unto himself. Nor does he die unto himself. His very cross becomes the heritage of mankind. There is nothing more intimate than a religious experience. But, on the other hand, there is nothing more expansive and inclusive than personality. It lives by sharing. 'He that loseth his life shall find it.' The rapture of the saint is attested most truly to be of God when it has been communicated to other souls. Prophets are few. But the Master's word must not be forgotten. We may receive a prophet in the name of a prophet, and so get a prophet's reward.

In these days when the fabric of Rome is being assailed by modernism, and when historical criticism has so transformed the Bible that it is no longer possible to declare inerrancy to be one of its notes, it is well to remember that the true strength of religion lies in the region of personal conviction and power. Indeed, the ideas of infallibility and inerrancy are more intellectual than religious. They are conceived with the object of buttressing religion from without. They arise in obedience to the demands of logic rather than of faith. They are in some degree abstract—abstractions from the rich concrete of religious experience. But religion must ever fear the abstract. This is not to say that the Church may not possess an august authority, mediated through her services and her teaching, and, in a secondary sense, through her creeds; or that the Bible may not speak with power to the hearts of men. But it is to say that the real testimony of the Church—the testimony that attests her as a true witness to divine things—is delivered in spite of her doctrine of infallibility; and, further, that men will more readily believe in the inspiration of the Bible,

because the Word has found and moved them, than begin with a hard-and-fast theory of inspiration and go on to accept what they regard as its logical consequences. The aristocratic element in the Church is not to be sought in her doctrine of infallibility, but in her sense of communion. The aristocratic note is heard less in the sonorous recitation of her creeds than in the prayers and aspirations of her choicer spirits. And since authority is personal and mediated through persons, its highest manifestation will be in the life that sustains the clearest and fullest communion with God. Mr. Leckie's chapter on the authority of Christ is full of reverence and wisdom. The Master, dwelling at the heart of things, has a wonderful power to bring us face to face with the realities of the spirit. There is something tremendously simple about the authority of Christ. The great doctrine of His Person is a noble attempt to account for that authority, but in regard even to the most august doctrines we are in the region of theory, where the categories of thought grapple with the transcendent facts of life. But faith has its reasons which the intellect may never fully formulate. It is for faith that Jesus is the supreme aristocrat, whose place is by the throne. To faith He speaks the last word on all that pertains to the essential life of mankind.

Contributions and Comments.

A Gaelic Gloss from Bobbio.

In the Latin Psalter of Columbanus of Bobbio, in which the marginal notes are in Gaelic, the comment on the words 'Mine ankles have not slipped' (Ps 18[36]) is 'Weariness comes not to my bones, though I travel firmly and for ever.'

The ancient Gaelic Commentator appreciates the special importance which the Psalmist associated with the ankles. The Hebrews and other primitive races adorned the ankles with bangles or anklets, not merely because of the additional comeliness imparted to the possessor of it by a good ankle, and not entirely because of the refreshment which the wearied traveller on the rough mountain path received from the musical clink of the anklet ornaments (*vide* 'Anklet'—Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*), but also because of more substantial reasons. The ankle was admired as the seat of peculiar strength.

Luke, in his description of the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the temple, says, 'His feet and *ankle bones* received strength,' and he adds that 'he, leaping up, stood and walked; and entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God.' Among primitive peoples, a good ankle is still prized as an indication of vigour.

A native of St. Kilda recently crossed to one of the Hebridean Islands, in Oriental fashion, to woo a lady who had been recommended to him by his friends. He returned home, however, unaccompanied by a bride, and his simple but conclusive explanation was, 'She did not have the ankle.' The appreciation of a good ankle was more than a mere matter of æsthetic taste. The agility required for travelling over bogs, or through a rocky country, depended largely on a good ankle. The St. Kildan's expression is still employed as an equivalent for the lack of strength and endurance.

The strengthening of the ankles meant the imparting of strength and endurance. It was the experience of God's presence that gave both of these to the Psalmist. Men who appeared stronger and more fortunate in everything, except the enjoyment of the Divine presence, failed in the battle of life. Hittites and Hivites and other races, that knew not the Psalmist's God, have perished; but the Jewish race still manifests the characteristics of strength and endurance, and in the words of the ancient Commentator of Bobbio can say, 'Weariness comes not to my bones, though I travel firmly and for ever.'

The earlier Latin translators failed to see this point when they rendered the Hebrew words, 'Et (not sunt) infirmata vestigia mea.' Later translators gave the sense more accurately in the words, 'Neque vacillant malleoli pedum meorum.' Neither the King James' translators nor the more recent revisers ventured to give the words of the Psalm the peculiar significance recognized in them by the ninth-century commentator, although in both the

Authorised and Revised Versions the marginal reading is 'ankles.' GEORGE R. MACPHAIL.

Dundee.

The Faith of Jesus.

IN the interesting article of Principal Forsyth on the faith of Jesus (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October 1909) we read: 'The New Testament writers seem almost deliberately to avoid applying to His relation to God the distinctive word which expresses ours both to God and Him.' May I call attention to He 12^2, where we are exhorted to look away unto 'Jesus, the captain and perfecter of faith.' The English version, to be sure, says *our* faith, but there is no authority for this, so far as I see, in the original. Jesus is described as the one who has brought faith to perfection—the *perfect example* of faith, we may paraphrase. This is in accordance with the context, for it is obvious that Jesus is the climax to whom the long list of Old Testament heroes leads up. As they through faith wrought righteousness and waxed valiant in fight, so He for the joy that was set before Him *endured the cross*, despising the shame—for endurance is more difficult than valiant action, and shame is harder to overcome than the most pugnacious foe. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

Meadville, Pa.

John ii. 19.

'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'

OUR Lord, no doubt, was acquainted with the two passages of the O.T. cited by Mr. Weir; and Ezr 5^{12} is interesting, as making it probable that the Aramaic word used was סתרו, 'Tear down!' (see also 1 Es 1^{55}). But I would not venture to say that our Lord's words were only 'a reminiscence and combination' of those two passages (Is 26^{19}, Ezr 5^{12}). What about the 'three days,' which made the statement so utterly incredible to the Jews? One cannot help recalling Hosea's 'On the third day He will raise us up' (Hos 6^2), and our Lord's own express reference to Jonah's 'three days and three nights in the whale's belly' (Mt 12^{40}).

Christ was speaking in the temple. It was therefore quite natural for His hearers to suppose that, when He said 'Destroy this temple!', He meant the temple in which they were all present at the moment. Even His disciples do not appear to have grasped the full meaning of His words until after the Resurrection which fulfilled them (v.^{22}). 'The temple of (consisting of) his body' (v.^{21}) would naturally be the last thing they would think of.

Why was it that our Lord spoke thus of His body? Not because the Aramaic word for 'temple' (היכלא) also meant 'body.' There is no trace of such a meaning either in Aramaic or in Hebrew. Nor can the origin and primary sense of this word be sought in the Arabic, where it is, in fact, a loan from the Aramaic. The real ancestor of the Semitic *haykal*, *hêkal*, 'temple,' is the far older Sumerian or proto-Babylonian EGAL, 'palace,' 'temple.' EGAL is a compound of the two very common Sumerian words E, 'house,' and GAL, 'great,' and accordingly denotes 'great house'; which is obviously a suitable description of either a king's or a god's house, a palace or a temple. These two meanings of the Sumerian term EGAL are also the meanings of the Assyrian derivative *ekallu*, as well as of the related Aramaic and Hebrew terms. Now, in view of our Lord's peculiar claims as represented in this Gospel, there was nothing very surprising in His calling His body 'this temple.' For, on the one hand, the human body, regarded as the dwelling-place of the soul or spirit, is a 'house' (Job 4^{19}, 'houses of clay'; 2 Co 5^1, 'our earthly tent-house'; cf. Jn 1^{14} ἐσκήνωσεν); and, on the other hand, a temple is a 'house of God' in ordinary Semitic speech (Gn $28^{17.\ 22}$, Neh 6^{10}; cf. the Assyrian *bît ili*, 'house of a god,' 'temple'). And if St. Paul could ask his converts, 'Know ye not that your body is a temple' (ναός, strictly 'dwelling'; from ναίω, 'to dwell') 'of the Holy Ghost in you?' or 'Know ye not that ye are God's temple, and the Spirit of God houseth in you?' (1 Co 6^{19} 3^{16}), with how much greater truth might His body be called a 'temple,' in Whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (Col 2^9).

But how is this saying of our Lord's relevant to the context? Clearly in this way. He has just expelled the dealers from His 'Father's House.' The Jews demand a 'sign' to justify this assumption of authority; and He answers them with an indirect intimation that He is Himself the Ultimate Authority. Standing there in the court of the

desecrated temple, He thinks of a higher, purer, truer Temple, His own immaculate Body, the shrine of Present Deity (chap. 14^{10}). Compare His saying on another occasion: 'A greater thing than the temple is here!' (Mt 12^{6}). And He, the Son of Man, does not say, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days *my Father* (or *God*; as, *e.g.*, Ro 10^{9}, 1 Co 6^{14}) will raise it up.' He says: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days will I raise it up'; thus affirming by implication His own equality, or rather identity, with God (see chap. 5^{21} 14^{9}). His actual words may have been סתרו היכלא הדין ובתלת יומין אקימניה. (See for קום, the Targum at Is 26^{9} and Hos 6^{2}).

C. J. Ball.

Oxford.

The Triumph-Joy.

I have read with considerable interest the article by Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., on the above subject. That the word θριαμβεύω was, in its origin, intimately associated with the Greek drama no one will deny, and Paul's knowledge of profane literature is amply borne out by his apt quotations from Aratus (Ac 17^{28}), Menander (1 Co 15^{33}), and Epimenides (Tit 1^{12}), his possible reference to the fable of Menenius Agrippa given by Livy (1 Co 12^{12-27}), and, on the authority of Sir W. M. Ramsay, his indebtedness to Athenodorus of Tarsus, whose writings had such an influence on Seneca also as to produce 'some very striking parallels' between the Apostle and the Stoic philosopher.

But it is noteworthy that the quotation from Aratus is from an astronomical poem, that from Epimenides from a treatise 'Concerning Oracles.' Livy and Athenodorus represent history and philosophy respectively, and the only *dramatist* is Menander. We have thus no authority for assuming that Paul was well acquainted with the Greek drama, and even if we had, is it not a fact that the original significance of θριαμβεύω had long been lost sight of in the Apostle's time, and had given way to the sense of 'triumph'? It is doubtless the element of 'joy' which unites the two significations—the song to Dionysus and the Roman triumph—but the context (and may we not add, contemporary usage?) so definitely marks out the latter meaning as to make the first part of Mr. Pope's article, if not irrelevant, at least of merely archæological interest.

I note also that, in dealing with the 'triumph,' he limits the application of the term to the conception of God 'leading his subjugated saints in triumph.' This brings the passage into line with Col 2^{15}, has the authority of Lightfoot and Meyer, and is doubtless true to Pauline experience, for the Damascus journey has transformed the enemy of Christ into His willing captive, and the Apostle was never wearied of setting forth the contrast in order to magnify the grace of God. He was made a prisoner, not to be dragged to death, but to march to eternal life!

There is, however, another interpretation, numbering Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, and Stanley among its supporters, which would find the analogue of the Christian in the victorious soldiers participating in the triumph. This does not seem to have found wide acceptance, and Christian experience—an exegete of no mean value—in endorsing it combines the former with it; the Christian is a Christ-conquered man, now become a soldier of the King.

The translation 'leadeth us in triumph' would obviously suit both meanings, and it might also cover a further interpretation which sees in the passage a word-picture of the Victor bringing His people triumphantly back to liberty, after subjugating the enemy that had enslaved them. We are Christ's *potentially* by blood-bought rights, but until Mansoul by its own consent allows Prince Emmanuel to defeat Diabolus, we can neither possess true liberty, nor grace the Conqueror's triumph.

Might I suggest yet another possibility? Sometimes the hero of the Roman triumph was accompanied in his car by his dearest friends. This interpretation would almost necessitate the hiphil sense of θριαμβεύω—'causeth us to triumph'—and this is the sense given by Beza in his version ('Qui facit ut semper triumphemus in Christo'); it is also one of the meanings attached to the word by Liddell and Scott, and Thayer-Grimm, while recording the adverse opinion of Lightfoot and Meyer, yet applies it to 2 Co 2^{14}. May not the Christian be regarded as the honoured friend of the great Victor, asked to accompany Him in the triumphal car, and share with Him the triumph-joy? It almost seems too daring! But the Conqueror Himself says to those who love Him, 'I have called you friends' (Jn 15^{15}).

Each interpretation, from varying view-points, is

true to Christian teaching and experience. This at least is plain, that whether we are regarded as captives, soldiers, subjects, or friends, ours is the triumph-joy.

ARTHUR B. KINSEY.

Aberdare.

'Stones of Rolling.'

IN the short notice of the newly issued 'Century Bible' volume, on *Ezra-Nehemiah-Esther* in your last issue, the writer says that when dealing with the same passages sometimes the 'Cambridge Bible' is more explicit and sometimes the 'Century Bible.' As an instance of the former, reference is made to what is said in both on Ezr 5^8. In the 'Century Bible' the 'Stones of rolling' (EVV, 'great stones') are defined as 'stones too large to be carried, and having therefore *to be rolled*.' In the 'Cambridge Bible' the words are, 'Stones too large for ordinary transport, and requiring to be *moved on rollers*.' The writer says the meaning is the same. I wish to say that the meaning is not the same, and that if I had been *as explicit* as the author of the 'Cambridge Bible,' it would, in my opinion, have been at the expense of accuracy.

There is evidence that among the Assyrians the roller, the lever, and the pulley were used, though not much is said about the roller. For removing to considerable distances there is overwhelming evidence that the waggon, cart, and especially the sledge, were constantly employed. There is no proof that the Hebrews used rollers, though there is no contrary evidence of a decisive character. Were the great stones of Ezr 5^8 and 6^4 literally rolled along until they were brought into position? This seems to me, as it did to Keil, Rawlinson, and others, likelier than the supposition that they were 'moved on rollers.' I preferred, however, in my 'Century Bible' volume, retaining the ambiguity of the Hebrew text, as is done by the latest and best German commentators (Bertheau, Ryssel, Siegfried, Bertholet, etc.).

Yet it seemed to me, at the same time, quite likely that the Massoretic text is at fault, for in the very same note I go on to say that, perhaps, changing one consonant we should read *gōdĕl* for *g'lāl* (written much the same as in unpointed Hebrew), and translate with the Peshitto Syriac and the English Versions 'great stones.' I am now quite convinced that this textual change ought to be made. The looser renderings of the LXX, Lucian and of the Apocryphal 1 Esdras 6^9 (see 'Century Bible'), can be best explained from the text as thus amended.

In Dt 5^{21} (EVV ^{24}) the Hebrew word *gōdĕl* stands in connexion with 'glory' (both of God), and in other passages it seems to denote 'splendour,' 'magnificence,' as well as 'greatness.'

T. WITTON DAVIES.

University College of North Wales.

The Camel and the Eye of the Needle.

WHEN Khizr Khan was married to the daughter of Alp Khan in 1312 A.D. there were rejoicings. 'The juggler swallowed a sword like water, drinking it as a thirsty man would sherbet. He also thrust a knife up his nostril. He mounted little wooden horses and rode upon the air. Large bodies were made to issue out of small ones; an elephant was drawn through a window, and a camel through the eye of a needle.' On this, in a note, the historian, Sir H. M. Elliot, comments: 'This is the original, and shows that those who object to the common reading of the Bible have no good ground for any alteration. The phrase is universal in the East to express any difficulty.'[1]

W. CROOKE.

Cheltenham.

'The Marks of Jesus.'

I VENTURE a conjectural combination which may add something to Deissmann's well-known discussion in *Bible Studies*. Can we trace the presence of these στίγματα elsewhere in the life of Paul?

What was it that prompted Lysias to identify Paul with the Egyptian bandit chief (Ac 21^{38})? The fury of the mob, mauling a man whom they would hate as having led some of their friends into a death-trap, might serve as a confirmation, but would hardly suggest the idea. It is clear that the rebel was at large; as certainly he was badly 'wanted.' We may safely assume that the Govern-

[1] See Sir H. M. Elliot, *The History of India as told by its own Historians*, iii. 553.

ment would circulate descriptions of such individuals, just as our own police do. The lines of such documents may be easily drawn from the εἰκόνες which abound among the papyri, identifying people signing official documents of all kinds. There is the subject's name, age, height, shape of face and nose, quality of hair, and especially the situation of identifying scars (οὐλή μετώπῳ, δεξιῷ ἀντικνημίῳ, etc.), which Egyptians of both sexes seem to have possessed to an abnormal extent: if such were absent, the description ἄσημος calls attention to the fact. If, moreover, he came from an outlying district, and was known to be deficient in Greek, he might perhaps be entered as ἀγράμματος, the word which in hundreds of papyri describes illiterates, who had to persuade some friend a little less unlettered to write for them.

With such an εἰκών stored in his memory, and assured of promotion if he is lucky enough to arrest its original, the Chiliarch eagerly scans his prize. Paul was so much exhausted with rough usage that he could not yet utter a word that might prove him Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκειν after all. And there was something in his face which identified him at once. The Egyptian Mahdi, who had attached his 400 *sicarii* to him by prowess in many a fight, would doubtless be well scarred. And Paul had been in the wars—wars in which his enemies' weapons at any rate had been decidedly carnal! One of them we specially recall here. The fickle Galatians of Ac 14 had taken good care that he should not a second time be mistaken for Hermes. The murderous stone that stretched him senseless in the street at Lystra was presumably aimed at his head, and its οὐλή is likely in after years to have been conspicuous enough to tally with the scar that figured in the εἰκών of the brigand chief. Well might Paul remind the Galatians of honourable marks that ought to have secured him from ingratitude in Lystra of all places!

Nor were these scars only the talisman which Christ's servant bore to secure him from ill-treatment at the hands of those who recognized his Master. They were 'the marks of *Jesus*,' marks which told that the servant had only been treated like his Lord. The acute and highly probable argument of Johannes Weiss seems to justify our inferring that Paul had *seen* that Face 'so marred more than any man'—seen it in the judgment hall and on Calvary before it looked down on him from heaven. If so, Myers was right—as poets have a way of being—when he makes Paul say of the 'sorrows of the Son of Man':

> Ah, with what bitter triumph had I seen them,
> Drops of redemption bleeding from thy brow!
> Thieves, and a culprit crucified between them,
> All men forsaking him—and that was thou!

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury.

Entre Nous.

The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

THE only way of reviewing the second volume here is by referring to other reviews. Quotations were made last month from such reviews as had then appeared. Many more have been issued now, and there is not one of them that has given a perfunctory notice of the volume. For fulness as well as appreciation the reviews of this volume have as yet surpassed those of the first volume.

THE GLASGOW HERALD.

More and more it becomes evident that this Encyclopædia—the first of its kind in any language—will make as well as mark an epoch in the history of the study of religion by providing in a form at once comprehensive and concise, scientifically exact, and yet eminently readable, all the available data for that great synthesis upon the subject towards which we are moving. The Parliament of Religions was useful, if slightly melodramatic: the meetings of the Congress of Religions at Basle and Oxford have done much to inspire isolated students and to consolidate their scattered labours. But in Dr. Hastings' Encyclopædia, with its unexampled accumulation and assortment of the facts provided by an exact study of the world's religions, historic and prehistoric, savage and cultured, ethnic and Christian, the materials are being brought together out of which a real science of comparative religion and a satis-

factory because all-inclusive philosophy of religion itself will eventually be shaped.

The Oxford Magazine.

The volume is written by specialists, and edited with the decisive judgment which we have learnt to expect from Dr. Hastings. It is not only a mine of information, but there is hardly an article which is not in itself worth reading for sheer interest.

The Liverpool Post.

In the second volume no better exemplification of the general scope and method of the Encyclopædia could be given than the article on 'The Abode of the Blest.' Here we have an article on the primitive and savage perceptions of the after-life, and subsequently, in detail, on the eschatology of Buddhism, of Ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome, Japan, and, in turn, of the Moslem, Persian, Semitic, Slavonic, Teutonic, and Celtic nations. This subject alone occupies no fewer than thirty closely printed pages of the Encyclopædia, nor are we able to say, after carefully perusing it, that it contains one unnecessary sentence or omits one necessary detail, and its interest is throughout enthralling.

The United Methodist.

The preacher will probably find the article on 'Bible in the Church,' by Dr. E. von Dobschütz, to be the most immediately valuable of all the contents of this volume. In some respects it breaks new ground, for so comprehensive an outline of the influence of the Bible on the Christian Church and the life of the Christian people has not before appeared.

The Christian Commonwealth.

The Encyclopædia is just what such a work should be, a mine of reliable learning, not an arsenal for argument or a field of dialectics. It is a monument of the intellectual enterprise and outstanding ability of its chief Editor, Dr. Hastings, who has no rival in this sort of difficult literary organization, which requires qualities akin to those which make a great military general. To survey the whole field, to arrange the operations, to get exactly the best man for each particular task, to synthesize the work of a multitude of minds, demands an order of genius. Under no other hands would such a prodigy of scholarship become possible. The Editor and his collaborators must be congratulated on having achieved in a difficult region a conspicuous success. The student in any branch of inquiry covered in this ample programme may be conducted at once to the guide eminently fitted to give instruction, and to open out to him the authoritative sources of knowledge.

The British Congregationalist.

It is in regard to the greater themes of religion and ethics that the primary interest will be felt. These are in all cases thoroughly, and in most cases finely, treated. The articles dealing with individuals—such as those on Augustine and Bunyan—are ample both in biographical material and in their account of the thought of the men. The articles on Berkeley and Bacon by Professors Barker and J. L. M'Intyre are marvels of a condensation which does not impair completeness or lucidity. More distinctly 'spiritual' themes, such as 'Aspiration,' are not forgotten, and a mass of information on topics like 'Asceticism,' on religions such as Buddhism, and on psychological matters such as 'Attention,' 'Belief,' and 'Association,' is accumulated in such wise that no one will come to these pages seeking in vain.

The Outlook.

But the English reader will probably turn first to Dr. Sanday's article on 'The Bible,' which occupies some thirty-four columns. It is marked by all the Lady Margaret Professor's devout caution in accepting 'results' and by his occasional courage in suggesting solutions. For example, he sums up the case as to the Fourth Gospel pretty much in the terms of his last volume on that subject—neither for nor against the son of Zebedee. But when Budde, following Duhm, suggests that much of the Davidic history may be attributed to the 'archives of the house of Abiathar,' Dr. Sanday is quite willing to accept the exiled priest not in person but just 'as a symbol of the conditions under which this earliest and best of all the specimens of Hebrew historical writing was composed.' We trust that those who read this article will go on to that of Ernst von Dobschütz on 'The Bible in the Church,' for we do not know any work that puts all the facts within the same compass.

Professor Driver.

On the 19th of January, the Regius Professor of Hebrew was presented with his portrait in the Chapter House of Christ Church, Oxford.

The presentation was made by Dr. T. Herbert Warren, Vice-Chancellor of the University. Dr. Driver said:

Mr. Vice-Chancellor and Gentlemen,—I hardly know in what terms to reply to the very kind and generous words which you have just spoken. You have said far more than is my due, and I really feel unable adequately to acknowledge it, or to express my grateful appreciation of the spirit which has prompted it. I need scarcely say how very much surprised I was when I was told by a member of the Committee of the kind wish of my friends that there should be in Christ Church a permanent likeness of myself, and of their desire to honour me with the very signal mark of appreciation and regard which they have presented to me to-day. I am still more surprised to hear now of the many distinguished scholars, who have joined with those whom I have the pleasure of knowing personally in doing me this honour. I shall always retain a vivid and grateful recollection both of the kind thought on the part of my more immediate friends and also of the cordiality with which so many scholars, far and near, have combined for this purpose. The portrait is a speaking one, and most admirably finished; a more skilful artist, or one who took greater pains and interest in his work, or, I may add, who made the sittings more agreeable to the sitter, it would, I am sure, have been impossible to find. I accept the portrait with the warmest gratitude and appreciation; both I and my wife will prize it as our choicest and most valued possession; and I shall place it in the lodgings of the Regius Professor of Hebrew in Christ Church as an heirloom for my successors. And I must, at the same time, express my thanks for the beautiful and interesting album containing the names of those who have contributed to the gift, which has been so thoughtfully compiled by the Committee. Will you bear with me for a few minutes while I say a few words about the course which the studies that I am interested in have taken during the last generation?

THE STUDY OF HEBREW.

My lot has been cast in a time of transition; and times of transition are proverbially difficult to hold one's course in successfully. When I began Oriental studies, though there were excellent Hebrew scholars in England, they had not published much, and little help was obtained by students in this country from English writings. It had thus to be shown how the Hebrew language could be studied in the light of comparative philology and modern scientific method. Hebrew grammar and Hebrew lexicography had both to be presented to English students with a completeness comparable to that which had been attained by the best foreign scholars. It is humiliating to have to say foreign scholars; but until recent years the spirit of research was only exceptionally displayed in this country; the brilliant pioneering labours of Rawlinson and Hincks in Assyriology were among the exceptions. But Englishmen as a rule were too often satisfied with the knowledge they had: independent study and research, carried on with that thoroughness and scientific method which are characteristic of our Teutonic cousins, was practically unknown in this country. Scholarly methods appeal to scholarly minds; and hence the influence which the scholarship in Germany—and that not only in Biblical subjects—when it became known in England, began quickly to exercise upon the best scholars among ourselves. And so this influence made itself felt in the study of Hebrew philology. There followed the question of text. It is true, editors of Hebrew and classical texts alike, have sometimes been rash and arbitrary in emendation: still, the fact remains that every scholar, not trammelled by dogmatic prepossessions, is at the present day convinced that the traditional Hebrew text of the Old Testament is in many places corrupt; internal evidence often strongly suggests it; the ancient versions preserve often transparently superior readings; and the character of the Hebrew script lends itself far more readily to corruption than do the scripts of ancient Greece and Rome. The only question open is the extent of the corruption. Here many things have to be taken into account; in the estimate formed of them, opinions naturally differ; and no one can be sure that he has struck the golden mean. Regard to probability, and the exercise of self-criticism, and self-distrust, are, perhaps, the surest guides. But unquestionably the labours of recent years have placed within the reach of students a better text of the Old Testament than was available a generation ago.

HIGHER CRITICISM.

After textual, or lower criticism, follows higher, or, as it might better be called, documentary criticism—the criticism which seeks to determine the structure, date, and authorship of (in particular) ancient writings. Forty years ago the traditional view of the origin of the Old Testament writings was held practically by all English scholars; and the few who ventured to question it were told authoritatively to stand down. But experience had proved before that suppressive measures are powerless to suppress free inquiry; the truth made itself known, and has gradually become more and more generally recognized. From the nature of the case, the literary problems presented by the Bible cannot always be determined in a categorical manner; details may be of an ambiguous character, and so not conclusive; the problem itself may be too complicated to be solved with certainty; hence every point cannot be determined with equal exactness and equal certitude. On the other hand, where numerous details, or independent lines of argument, converge in the same direction, conclusions of great probability, or even of practical certainty, may be confidently formed. And so the general structure of the books composing the Old Testament, and the stages by which, as a whole, it gradually assumed its present form, have, in their broader features, been satisfactorily determined.

HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

With higher criticism historical criticism is closely associated: each in its turn is ancillary to the other: but as branches of study the two are, of course, distinct. It is a commonplace of historians that history must be built upon a criticism of sources. And the closer study of the Old Testament, which has been the outcome of recent years, has shown that the narratives contained in it must be used by the historian with discrimination: some are much more remote than others from the events which they describe, and are thus not of equal historical value. Since Ewald, between 1843 and 1859, published his epoch-making work, the distinction has been more and more recognized by all who have made any pretension to write the history of Israel from the standpoint of a modern historian. We cannot, while the history of every other people has been placed on a more scientific basis than it occupied two generations ago, leave the history of Israel as it was. A presentation of it, making use of improved methods and taking account of distinctions formerly unrecognized, cannot be dispensed with. The same may be said of the history of Israel's religion. Here also the historical method has shown that growth is to be recognized more fully than was formerly the case. The Bible contains the record of a progressive revelation, and of an ever broadening and deepening apprehension of religious truth. An endeavour must be made to determine the stages through which the religion of Israel passed; and the relation in which the utterances of the prophets and poets of Israel stood to the age in which they individually lived, and to the circumstances of their time, must be recognized and exhibited. On both the political and the religious history of Israel great light has been thrown by the often astonishing archæological discoveries of the last half-century; the history and civilization of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt have been exhumed from the dust in which they were buried, and spread out before us in distinct and brilliant colours: the position which Israel took, by the side of these and other neighbours, has become much clearer to us than it once was; in particular, the influence of Babylonia upon it, while less indeed than has been maintained by some modern scholars, is known now to have been much greater than was once even suspected. The contemporary inscriptions of Israel's more immediate neighbours, the study of which was first placed upon a sound foundation by Gesenius in 1837, and the known number of which has since largely increased, afford many welcome illustrations of the ideas or language of the Old Testament.

NEW KNOWLEDGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Excavation in Palestine has also taught us much; and the comparative study of religions has thrown valuable light on the origin and import of many of the customs and institutions of ancient Israel. A modern teacher of Old Testament subjects cannot confine himself to the Old Testament alone: he must be more or less familiar with such ever-widening subjects as I have just indicated. With whatever part of the Old Testament he is dealing, one or other of them may at any time illustrate it, or have a determining influence on

his conclusions respecting it. The knowledge and methods possessed by our forefathers are no more adequate now in philological and historical studies than they are in the study of natural science. We cannot either study, or understand, the Old Testament precisely as our ancestors did. It would be a dereliction of duty to withhold from the present generation of learners the light which by the providence of God has from different directions been thrown upon it. It has been my endeavour to take part with others in utilizing this new knowledge for the purpose of elucidating either the language or the contents of the Old Testament, as the case might be, and making it more intelligible, and, I hope, in consequence enabling it to be read with better comprehension and appreciation of its import than was possible a generation or two ago. I have also sought, in a time of transition, to distinguish between new views that were promulgated, to point out what ground was stable, what conclusions followed with reasonable probability from the data at our disposal, and what were more or less hypothetical constructions, which might or might not be confirmed in the future. And I take it as indicating on the part of those who have combined to offer me to-day this most gratifying token of regard, their sense that I have not altogether failed in the efforts I have made to contribute something towards that re-vivification of Biblical study, and re-discovery of the historical significance of the Bible, for which so much has been accomplished in the present generation. It has already often been to me a genuine help and encouragement to find how many men of knowledge and ability and judgment—some my own personal pupils, and others approaching the subject independently—have followed substantially the same lines that I have taken myself; and I cannot say how materially these feelings have been strengthened by the far-reaching sympathy and approval which has been so warmly and eloquently attested by the noble present which has been given to me to-day. I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, for your kindness in presiding on this occasion, upon a day which I shall never forget, and for the words of too generous appreciation which you have spoken; I thank the Committee and the secretaries for what, I am sure, the latter especially must have found often a toilsome work; and I thank from the bottom of my heart the friends, absent as well as present, who have combined to present me with this most touching expression of their appreciation and esteem.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. E. J. Roberts, B.D., Baptist Church, Melbourne, Derbyshire, to whom a copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 1st of March. The text is Rev 21^{5}.

The Great Text for May is Rev 21^{27}—'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, or of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev $22^{3.4}$—'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 22^{14}—'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' A copy of Walker's *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister and his Duties*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 22^{17}—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.' A copy of Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January is a review by Professor Sanday of the 'Cambridge Biblical Essays' (Macmillan; 12s. net). That volume was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES immediately after its issue. And a continued use of it has deepened the impression then conveyed that it is a book of the first importance.

The importance of the book does not lie in the additions which it makes to our knowledge of the Bible. It does not make many additions. That was not the purpose, we may be sure, for which the book was planned and prepared; it is certainly not the end that has been attained. We are always glad of the least addition to our knowledge of the contents of the Bible or even of its surroundings. But we have more occasion for gladness when men whom we can trust tell us how to value and how to use the abundant knowledge which we already possess.

There is Dr. Johns, for example, whose article is on the 'Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament.' We know a great deal now about Babylonian mythology. We have read and written not a little about its influence upon the Old Testament. But what is it all worth? What use can we make of it? This is just what Dr. Johns tells us. This is just what Professor Sanday finds to be 'the most interesting feature in the essay.'

For we no longer need the evidence of the monuments to prove that the Bible is true. It is long since we have seen that the monuments are more in need of the support of the Bible than the Bible of the monuments. Even Professor Sayce told us years ago that 'the Assyrian kings are brazen-faced liars on their monuments.' What we want to know now is the religious value of the early narratives of Genesis.

Well, in order to obtain that knowledge, we must set the early narratives of the Bible beside the early mythology of the Babylonians. And not of the Babylonians only. Nor only of those races which are in closest geographical proximity to the Hebrews. If the Babylonian mythology serves the purpose best, it will be because it is best known, not because it is nearest. What we need, in short, is just what Dr. Johns gives us here—in the words of Dr. Sanday, 'a sympathetic, and therefore (as I conceive) really intelligent treatment, of the early mythologies.'

Our first mistake was to go to the monuments for evidence of the truth of the Bible. That was excessive humility on our part. For the Bible is its own evidence; otherwise it could not possibly

be the Bible. But we made a greater mistake than that. We went to the monuments to prove our own interpretation of the Bible. And that was as excessive arrogance. The monuments have not supported our interpretation. They have shown us that it was a mistaken interpretation. And we have sometimes been led to revise our interpretation; and sometimes we have simply been disappointed. Dr. Johns goes to the monuments in order that by their aid he may understand what the Bible really is. He lays the Babylonian texts by the side of the Hebrew texts that the one may interpret the other, and that out of the comparison he may understand how much is truth and how much is only vehicle, how much is primitive and accidental and how much is eternal.

Professor Sanday quotes considerable portions of Dr. Johns' paper, and some of it he throws into italics. He is evidently anxious, like the rest of us, to get at the back of that word 'myth.' For we speak freely enough of the mythology of Babylonia, but we scarcely dare use the word myth in relation to Israel. If the question were asked, Is the Fall a myth? we should call it another way of asking, Is the Fall a lie? But what is a myth? '*Many so-called myths*,' says Dr. Johns (and Dr. Sanday throws the two sentences into approving italics), '*are primitive attempts to put an hypothesis into words before language has become sufficiently developed for scientific terms to be available. Recourse is invariably had to metaphor.*'

Dr. Johns takes the example of an eclipse. There is good reason to suppose that the Babylonians knew what caused an eclipse, though they may not have known just how the moon got between us and the sun. When, therefore, they said that a dragon had devoured the sun, 'they could not (Dr. Sanday again uses italics) have believed in the actual existence of a dragon, even if their fathers and some ignorant folk among them still did so.'

Pass to the sixth essay in the volume. Its title is 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis.' Its author is Mr. Israel Abrahams, University Reader in Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature. Here the ignorance of the average Gentile is so great that the addition of actual information may be considerable. But that is not why Dr. Sanday pronounces this essay to be one of the most interesting and valuable in the book. It is because it marks an advance in method in the branch of study which it commends. 'Until a comparatively recent date,' says Dr. Sanday, 'prejudice has been too much at work on both sides. Christian scholars have either unduly ignored the assistance which Rabbinic literature might have given them, or else they have collected such data as they could chiefly for polemical purposes. And, on the other hand, Jewish scholars have retaliated in the same polemical spirit.' Mr. Abrahams' article is the same sort of contribution as we have already had from Dr. Johns. The recognition of priority in time on the part of some Jewish Rabbi does not make a great gospel text superfluous or untrue. Bring the Jewish Rabbi's saying into comparison sympathetically. The saying itself may obtain a wider meaning and a deeper, and Christ may be better understood—understood to be the Christ of the Jews as well as of the Gentiles.

There is one thing in this volume which distinguishes it from the previous volume of 'Theological Essays,' which was published in 1905. The contributors to the 'Theological Essays' were members of the English Church, and all but one were of the clergy. The present book, on the other hand, 'contains essays by members of several religious bodies, and among the essayists are five laymen.' Professor Sanday likes that. And when he reaches the eleventh essay on Jesus and Paul, which is written by Professor Anderson Scott of Westminster (Presbyterian) College, it is evidently a particular pleasure to him to find it so good, and to be able to say that it is 'a really helpful contribution, grappling with the subject at closer quarters and more along its whole breadth than

anything that I remember to have seen upon it in English.' But the next essay is by Professor Percy Gardner, and it is no surprise to find Dr. Sanday arrested there.

For Professor Percy Gardner is a most difficult writer to deal with. He is so fair, and yet so unfair. He makes so many concessions that it seems ungracious to grudge him his own little individualities. And yet these individualities, with all the sweetness of their expression, are really enough to carry away the foundation upon which rests the whole gospel of the grace of God.

Dr. Sanday has always been gentle with Professor Percy Gardner. He is gentle here. We are not quite sure that he would be so gentle if he realized how little of the historical in the New Testament Professor Gardner really leaves with us. Even here, where the subject is the Speeches of St. Paul in Acts, so much is taken away of the speeches at Lystra and at Athens that Dr. Sanday is constrained to enter an emphatic protest. But he passes from it, to notice, with unmistakable pleasure, an incidental paragraph on the subject of inspiration, and to say that 'the essay would have been well worth publishing if it had contained nothing else.'

This is the paragraph: 'From the present point of view the question of inspiration or non-inspiration of a book is not primary. For how does divine inspiration act upon a writer? In two ways: first, by strengthening and intensifying his natural powers; and second, by producing in him what W. James has called an uprush of the sub-conscious. I should prefer to call the last an inrush of the super-conscious. It makes a man a vehicle of deep-lying forces, so that he builds better than he knows. He may think that he is writing for a society, or even for an individual, when he is really writing for future ages, and to meet needs of which he is unconscious.'

That is the paragraph. What does Professor Sanday say about it? He says: 'The appeal to the sub-conscious is, I venture to think, fraught with great promise, not only in this, but in many other directions. It happens, by a coincidence, that I am myself having recourse to it for another purpose at the present time. But on this subject of inspiration, I fully believe, with Dr. Gardner, that it opens out new vistas; and I am very grateful to him for the form which he has given to his statement.'

The last essay in the book is by its editor, Professor Swete. It is an essay on the religious value of the Bible. It is not a summary or criticism of the contents of all the essays that have gone before. The essayists were allowed to write in their own way, and the essays are allowed to stand on their own merits. But it expresses the spirit of the book; and if it had been found at the beginning it would have been a useful lead to the understanding of the great gift which these Cambridge scholars have given us.

Dr. Sanday is delighted with it. It 'breathes all the *mitis sapientia* of Dr. Swete.' It is 'not only characteristic of its author, but it may be said to be also characteristic of the present day and of the book as a whole. It shows that wide tolerance and open-minded recognition of good from all sides which marks the age to which we belong.'

Then Professor Sanday quotes this paragraph: 'The Gospels exhibit this pattern, and it is this which gives them a religious value that even in the Bible itself is unique. No criticism, whether of the sources of the Gospels or of their historical details, can greatly affect their value in this respect. It is independent of our acceptance of the miracles. That it can even survive an abandonment of the Catholic Doctrine of the Person of Christ, or a refusal to analyze the impression which the Gospels convey upon that subject, may be seen from the earlier lectures of Adolf Harnack's *What is Christianity?* No more enthusiastic appreciation of the religious value of the Gospel life of Jesus can be found than in that remarkable book, which is

nevertheless written from the standpoint of a Christology that can satisfy no Catholic Christian.'

Professor Sanday, we say, quotes that paragraph, and he asks: 'Would it have been written so lately as ten years ago, even by Dr. Swete?' But it has been written now. It has been written by Professor Swete of Cambridge, and Professor Sanday of Oxford agrees with it. 'That is the temper of Cambridge; and it is also the temper of Oxford, and (I think I may add) of enlightened opinion in this country generally. We do not intend to let the anchor drag loose from our own moorings; but we do intend to welcome that which is good, from whatever quarter it may come; and we shall judge those who differ from us, not merely on party lines, but on the extent to which the opinions which they express commend themselves to reason and conscience.'

Professor Cheyne has sent to the *Christian Commonwealth* of February 16 a review of Mr. Claude Montefiore's *Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. It is a review of four great columns in length. For the book appeals to him. He looks at our Lord with something of the same admiring detachment of mind as that with which He is regarded by Mr. Montefiore, and he is pleased with Mr. Montefiore because Mr. Montefiore the Jew is so well pleased with Jesus.

Professor Cheyne is 'not offended either at an occasional unfavourable criticism of sayings of the Master or at a frank recognition of imaginative elements in the Gospels.' It is true that Mr. Montefiore is a Jew, and 'a fervent Jew.' He does not believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and he does not believe that He is the Messiah. But what of that? 'If Jesus was really more perfectly man than we were taught to suppose, and if He has been more absolutely identified with one of God's "countenances" (to speak in Semitic fashion) than is justifiable by the ascertainable facts, need we feel our Christianity imperilled?'

The book appeals to him, even to the length of its *a priori* canons of criticism. Mr. Montefiore cautions us against supposing that a given passage is authentic in proportion to the age of the 'source' which records it. Dr. Cheyne agrees. And he agrees when Mr. Montefiore says that the point is, where would tradition remember truly, and where would it consciously or unconsciously add, alter, and embroider? It is a pity he does not tell us how we are to know what tradition would be likely to do.

Again, Mr. Montefiore warns us against 'the illusory canon' that the noblest and most original sayings must be authentic, as being worthy of none but Jesus. And again Professor Cheyne agrees. 'One of the noblest,' says Mr. Montefiore, 'is surely, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Lk 23^{34}). And yet this is almost certainly not authentic.' Now it is a remarkable circumstance that Westcott and Hort, who knew quite as well as Montefiore and Cheyne how the external evidence stands, while coming to the conclusion that this saying did not originally belong to St. Luke's Gospel, are nevertheless quite emphatic about its being an authentic saying of Jesus. Their words are: 'Few verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than this first of the Words from the Cross.' In short, they simply accept 'the illusory canon' that the noblest and most original sayings must be authentic as being worthy of none but Jesus.

But if Professor Cheyne is pleased with Mr. Montefiore's Commentary, he is most of all pleased with it when the author undertakes the emendation of the Gospel text. There are two passages which he particularly commends.

The first is Lk 11^{41}. The literal translation is, 'Give for alms the things that are in it, and behold all things are clean unto you.' That, says Professor Cheyne, is impossible. He goes back with Mr. Montefiore to the Aramaic. In Aramaic *zakki*

means 'give alms,' and *dakki* means 'cleanse.' Read, therefore, 'Cleanse what is within, and surely all is clean to you.'

The other passage is the Parable of the Good Samaritan. It is a parable that has been misnamed. There is no Samaritan in it. Following the great Jewish scholar J. Halévy, Mr. Montefiore says that the Samaritan was not a Samaritan, but an Israelite. 'Priest, Levite, and Samaritan,' he says, 'is no less queer and impossible than Priest, Deacon, and Frenchman would be to us to-day. Most probably the alteration was simply due to the uncomprehendingness of Gentile Christians, who did not know that "Israelite" was commonly used for a man who was neither Priest nor Levite.' Professor Cheyne cannot say whether the alteration was deliberate or accidental. He is quite sure it is an alteration.

But beyond his pleasure in the Commentary, and beyond his delight in the textual criticism, Professor Cheyne approves of the book because of the 'reverent admiration' which Mr. Montefiore feels for Jesus. He quotes two passages. 'The love of Jesus for children must have been a historic and characteristic trait. He must have been one of the most sympathetic and human of men.' That is the one passage. And this is the other: 'How much strength has not the prayer at Gethsemane given to endless human souls! And why should it not, even though for us Jesus is neither God nor Messiah, give strength to Jewish hearts also? We must restore this hero to the bead-roll of our heroes.'

One of the Assistant Masters at Harrow has translated and edited the work entitled *Jéhovah* of Professor Westphal of Montauban, and he has persuaded Dr. Ryle to write a foreword. Dr. Ryle is now a bishop. He has been a bishop for a good many years. But there was a time when he was the strongest Old Testament teacher in Cambridge, and this foreword shows that he has still the teacher's instinct for the instruction that has life in it.

What Dr. Ryle was in Cambridge has been told by Professor James Hope Moulton in an article 'About Some Teachers' in the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for February. Dr. Moulton says: 'By far the greatest power in the University in my time on the religious side was Professor Herbert Ryle. Lucid and learned, fearlessly progressive but deeply reverent, Professor Ryle's teaching was among the best I ever knew. He was extremely popular and influential with the men, and seemed to have reached an ideal sphere when they made him Head of a "House." Why, oh why did the authorities insist on his taking up a hereditary position on the bench of bishops?'

But we say, and in spite of that wail, it is evident that the Bishop of Winchester has not lost his interest in the Old Testament. For the book to which he has written this foreword—it is called in English *The Law and the Prophets* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net)—is a book which no man would give his name to unless he approved of it, and no man would approve of it who had not been moving forward with the progress of Old Testament study.

For Professor Westphal is not simply a follower of Wellhausen. Far as he is removed from the traditional reader who takes the books of the Old Testament in their familiar order, and squares the ethics of Judges with that of Isaiah, he is as far removed from the popular critic of the moment who calls the opening chapters of Genesis fragments of Babylonian mythology, denies the existence of the patriarchs, and discovers Jehovah in the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai—a little local deity worshipped by some Kenite tribe. And it is not that he is simply a conservative critic. It is not that he simply occupies a middle position. Let us touch the three topics just mentioned. And let us take them up in their inverse order.

The first, then, is the origin of Jehovah the God

of Israel. The most popular belief at present is that Moses and the Israelites found Him at Sinai, a God worshipped by some nomad tribes accustomed to encamp there. Professor Westphal does not believe it. If the Israelites came to Sinai, they came there under the protection of a God of some kind, and with some name to be known by. Now there is no case in history, he says, of a nation abandoning their own God and accepting the God of another nation simply because He made Himself terrible by means of 'a few claps of thunder.' And how is He said to have recommended Himself? By chastising them. 'The peculiarity of Jehovah, from His first appearance, is to command, and to strike mercilessly when disobeyed'—a strange début, says Professor Westphal, for a deity who, without any previous record, sought to supplant the old teraphim of Israel.

'But if, on the contrary'—and we shall quote Professor Westphal's exact words now—'under the new and suggestive name given Him by Moses' reformation, He is the same ancestral God whose blessings are bound up with the life of the Hebrew patriarchs, and if, in the events of a supreme crisis, He has just shown Himself the deliverer of the tribes which call upon Him, then everything becomes clear and intelligible.'

The next thing is the existence of the patriarchs. Jehovah is represented as saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' This is said to have been the credentials with which Moses was sent down into Egypt. Well, if Moses ever was sent into Egypt, and if he did deliver the Israelites, what other credentials had he? What other explanation is there of the authority he obtained over the Israelites? Just as the reforms of Moses are necessary to the understanding of the prophets, so, says Professor Westphal, historical continuity requires the nomad life of the patriarchs, the distress of the descendants of Abraham, and the miraculous deliverance of the Exodus, to account for the authority of Moses and the building of the national constitution on the Law (the Torah) of Jehovah.

There remain the early narratives of Genesis, the first eleven chapters, which seem to have no connexion with the history of the Hebrews, and are said to contain traditions which are common to all the Semitic nations. Is it a mere literary accident that has linked these traditions to the call of Abraham? And is it a scientific duty to let them sink back again into the common heap of Oriental myths? Professor Westphal thinks our duty lies elsewhere.

For, in the first place, it is a fact that no Semitic religion contains all the traditions recorded in the early chapters of Genesis. Nowhere else are they grouped in the same way, and nowhere else is any one of them found described with the same fulness or precision. In the next place, the call of Abraham is unintelligible without them. Says Professor Westphal, 'If the Bible story began with the call of Abraham, the drama of salvation, of which the history of the patriarchs is the first act, would open without anything to explain its subject, or to interest us in the plot, and the later acts would leave the riddle still unsolved. "God said (what God?) to Abraham (who is that?), in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (what is the meaning of that?). Re-read the opening pages of Genesis and everything is accounted for. What was reputed a handful of Semitic traditions, unconnected with the history of Israel, becomes the forecourt of the temple where God waits to teach and redeem humanity.'

The last thing is that Professor Westphal does not attempt to square the ethics of the Book of Judges with the ethics of the Book of Isaiah. He does not believe that 'the whole' of Revelation was completely contained in each successive moment of its history. This, he holds, is a common but most regrettable error of writers of Bible Histories. They strive to demonstrate the scientific accuracy of the account of the Creation, 'as if the men who

wrote it had known the theories of Galileo and of Darwin.' If the subject is the religion of Abraham, they attribute to him the monotheism of Moses, as if God had never needed to say to Moses, 'Hear, O Israel, thy God is the only God there is.' In the stories of Jephthah, Samuel, or Elisha, everywhere and always we assume that the men of the Old Testament were, from the outset, all equally acquainted with the moral and religious content of the revelation preached by an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, if not even by Jesus Christ and St. Paul.

Professor Westphal calls this historical heresy. In art it would be called a lack of perspective. It would recall the paintings of the earliest masters, of Cranach or of Albert Dürer. And what is the effect of it? Its effect is to suggest that men who behave at times like the uttermost barbarians have been taught all the will of the just and holy God, and have even been commanded to behave thus barbarously. Professor Westphal takes the revelation of God in the Bible as historical and progressive. And he takes these words loyally and courageously in the fulness of their meaning. He tells his pupils that in the early stages of Bible history there was not a direct, immediate, and adequate revelation of the true God, but an indirect and educational revelation, which was to the true knowledge of God, as the shadow of blessings to come, to use a Biblical phrase, is to the glorious light of Christ, or as the milk which children enjoy is to the meat which only the adult can digest.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Aberdeen.

Part II.

IV. (*continued*). This incidental allusion to the true nature of the Eucharist in 1 Co 10^{16-21}, therefore, must not be read as if it were a formal description according to the conditions of time and sequence. It is an exposition of truth, into which time does not enter. Paul shows what is the real meaning of the Church ceremony (which he understands as being familiarly known to the Corinthians), partly by direct interpretation, and partly by contrast with the rites of pagan dæmonic powers, rites which had an outward similarity to the Christian rite, but which were absolutely opposite in character and power. Nowhere does Paul show more clearly that he conceived the universe as a balance, more or less uneasy, between vast contending forces. The world around us cannot be understood, according to his view, as an inert mass: it is a war of tremendous powers, sweeping the life of man with them towards evil or towards good. In such a simple situation as the invitation given to a Corinthian Christian by some pagan friend are involved infinite possibilities and mighty forces of good and bad, of right and wrong. By participating in the pagan ceremonies, which were a necessary accompaniment of every pagan feast, the Christian entered into a fellowship united through dæmonic powers, and was thereby repelled from the fellowship which is cemented by the Christian sacrament.

No one can read this passage intelligently without perceiving that Paul regarded the Eucharist not as a mere symbolic ceremony, but as a force of infinite potentiality in the life of man and in the constitution of the Church. So far as we can judge, Mark and Matthew regard the ceremony as teaching of important truth through parable; but the teaching is the prediction of the Saviour's death. They do not intimate any wider meaning in the acts and words; and they do not show any appreciation of force and driving power inherent in the due performance of the rite. To Paul the rite has far greater significance than we should gather from the narrative of Mark; and yet his opinion on this matter is seen only from his chap. 10, and would not readily be gathered from chap. 11, as we shall see.

We take κοινωνία δαιμονίων in the sense of 'a communion and fellowship (of men with one

another) united and cemented through dæmonic powers.' That, however, is not the meaning which most scholars take. It is a more common view to understand the κοινωνία δαιμονίων as 'the communion with dæmonic powers' (so, for example, Professor Gwatkin in his *Early Church History*, i. p. 268). Throughout the passage the genitive with κοινωνία seems to be used in the same sense. In 10[16] it is the fellowship and unity of the Brotherhood cemented through participation in the Cup and the Bread of the Eucharist. The Cup and the Bread are to Paul the fellowship of the Blood and the Body, *i.e.* the fellowship which is created and constituted through the Blood and the Body. He is speaking of forces and spiritual powers, not of material things. Those are the realities of life: the spirit is the true body: the material thing is merely outward appearance, the measure of man's ignorance, the existing proof of man's inability to discern the spiritual reality behind the external show. So again in 10[18], 'They who eat the (Hebrew) sacrifices are a body of fellows of the Thysiasterion' ('altar,' R.V.), where there cannot be any doubt that Paul is describing the unity of the Hebrew race through their common relation to the Thysiasterion.

It is also clear that in Paul's estimation, just as every pagan feast was a rite fraught with vast potentialities of evil through the fellowship of dæmonic powers, so every common meal where several of the faithful were met together was a potential sacrament. There can be no thought of anniversaries or of recurrence on some special day or occasion in such an idea as he had. No connexion of the Sacrament with the Passover was possible in his mind: the Passover was an annual feast according to the Law: the Sacrament was a permanent factor, always existent, in the common life of the Brotherhood.

More formally and intentionally descriptive is the passage 1 Co 11[20-30]. Accordingly, inferences as to time and order are here permissible; and we observe that the Bread is first; it is a part of the meal; and after the meal was the Cup.[1] This expression 'after the supper' is quite conclusive as to the succession of the acts; and the same order appears also in vv.[26. 27. 28. 29], which are more allusive and therefore less decisive as evidence; the succession in them is determined by the succession previously stated in vv.[23-25].

We observe that Paul states the authority and sanction on which the Church rite is founded: the authority is that of the Lord Himself. The exact meaning of the words has been a subject of dispute: 'I received from the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.' This which he had received was the rite of the Bread and Wine, which he had taught the Corinthians to celebrate. Did Paul receive the knowledge direct from the Lord, or as handed down in the tradition from the Lord's lips?

The question was worth raising. It is inevitably raised by every one who reads the passage with an inquiring mind. Yet the answer cannot long be doubtful. If Paul claimed here to have received this knowledge direct from the Lord, he would be practically claiming to have founded the ceremony, and to have made the Church accept it, and to be the authority from whom the narrative, as it appears in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, was derived. How explain the universal acceptance by the Church? How explain the narratives of the Gospels, taken on credit from Paul and interpolated in the rest of the story which is derived from other authorities, and yet containing so many divergences from the one authority in regard to this ceremony. It is true that divergences occur in the different accounts of Paul's Conversion, all of which are founded ultimately on his authority; but those are divergences of a different kind. The only rational and the only possible explanation of the acceptance of the Eucharistic ceremony in all sections of the Church, even those hostile to Paul, is that it was handed down from the Lord.

Accordingly Paul means practically, 'I am only a link in the chain of tradition, reaching from the Lord at the Last Supper down to you.' The correlative terms which he uses, παρέλαβον and παρέδωκα, imply this. From his statement we must infer that the ceremony was practised by all Christians, that it was a necessary and universal part of the Christian religion, and that it was in existence from the beginning. Hence the words and the rite were familiar to all Christians in the ordinary service of the Church; and a revelation was not needed to communicate them to Paul. His point is not that he had a special revelation, but that the rite was fundamental and universal in Christianity; and in so far as he added anything on his own account (except simply to declare more

[1] Hence v.[20], 'When ye assemble . . . , it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper.' The main action causes the name. The Cup was a subsequent stage 'after the supper.'

clearly the meaning of the words and acts), he detracted from the universality, and spoiled his own case.

Yet the theory has been seriously advanced that the command to repeat the rite as a ceremony of remembrance was unknown to the authors of the four Gospels, or was not believed by them to be genuine; that it was added by Paul on the authority of a private and special revelation made to him; and finally, that this command was interpolated in the text of Luke's Gospel. In proof of this latter part of the theory, it is pointed out that the Western text of Luke omits the command. On this theory we have to suppose that Paul seriously remodelled the sacred rite and gave it new meaning and greater importance. All such theories are inconsistent with the situation and the facts established by general consent.

Now let us carefully examine the account that Paul gives—professedly and intellectually the account of a rite long habitual in the Church, and coming down from the institution by the Lord. The very fact that it was universally familiar makes Paul's account brief, and prevents him from referring to it often in his letters. It was too well known to need emphasis or description. In writing to the Corinthians, these allusions to it are forced on him in the critical question of the right of Christians to participate in feasts at which pagan gods were honoured. Those gods were in themselves nought; but they barred the Christians who took part in their honour from the table of the Lord: 'Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of dæmonic beings.'

It is convenient to arrange the steps of the rite as Paul mentions them in the same way as those which Mark describes. We keep the same numbers, stating within square brackets those which Paul omits, and marking by an asterisk those which Paul mentions and which Mark omits. Where Paul describes in two stages an act which Mark sums up in one stage, or where Paul mentions one stage of an act of which Mark mentions only the other, we designate the two stages by the same number with the letters A and B.

1. He took bread.

2. He gave thanks (in Mark, He blessed it).

*3A. He brake the bread.

[3B. omitted: He gave to the Twelve.]

4A. He said, 'This is my body' [Paul omits 'take'].

*4B. 'Which is for you: this do in remembrance of me.'

5. The cup after supper: 'in like manner' implies 'he took.'

6. 'In like manner' implies 'he gave thanks.'

7. 'In like manner' implies 'he gave to the Twelve.'

[8. omitted (in Mark: 'they all drank': in Matthew and Luke the command to drink is given).]

9A. He said, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.'

*9B. 'This do, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me.'

[10. omitted: a prediction.]

In Paul's formal description of the rite as it was performed, two steps of the action, which Mark mentions, are omitted wholly: two are omitted partly: three are left to be inferred from the word 'in like manner.' Yet the sequence shows that there was no difference between the two recorders in regard to the acts: the omitted steps can be inferred from those which are mentioned. So the fact that all the disciples ate of the bread is not mentioned either by Mark or by Paul, yet it can be inferred from the details that they mention; and it is implied in 10^{17}.

In narrating a series even of the simplest actions, no two observers will select exactly the same details. Every describer will omit some matters as being implied in those which he mentions; and no two will omit the same steps in the action.

It is characteristic of Paul's style that it is hardly possible to say where the words which the Lord speaks end, and where his own comment begins. Is v.[26], 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come,' Paul's interpretation, or does he give this as part of the words of Jesus? The answer must be sought in probabilities and in comparison of other accounts. From Paul's letter we could not come to any sure conclusion, though the word 'for' suggests rather that he attributes the words to Jesus. But none of the other accounts give these words, or anything exactly corresponding to them; and yet even that is not conclusive, for 10^{17} and other records imply that more was said than is quoted by any authority.

All that can be asserted is that Paul gradually changes from direct quotation of the Lord's words to statement of his own inferences from the words.

Similarly in Gal 2[14ff.], it is impossible to tell where the words which Paul actually addressed to Peter end, and where the moral which he drew for the benefit of the Galatians begins:[1] he gradually and insensibly passed from the one to the other. As we have seen, there was much instruction given in discourse by Jesus at this stage of the Supper; and, even though no other authority records these words of v.[26], it is quite possible that Paul believed them to have been spoken by the Lord. But v.[27] is, unquestionably, Paul's inference and interpretation: Jesus pronounced no words of condemnation and denunciation here, not even though Judas Iscariot was present (for so we shall see was the case, disguised as it is by Mark and Matthew).

While Paul's second account of the Eucharist has the value of being a literal and matter-of-fact description of the rite as he transmitted it to the Corinthians (and therefore to all his Churches), and so carries back the tradition to the time of his conversion a few years after the Crucifixion[2]—except for those who, in defiance of the deep conservatism of the East in matters of ritual like this, suppose that the ceremony was transformed and remade during the extension of the Church to the Gentiles—the first account has in some respects an even higher value, when it is regarded from the proper point of view. It is from chap. 10 that we learn most about the power and meaning which Paul felt to lie in the Eucharist. That point of view is one with which, in modern times, many find it difficult fully to sympathize. Paul's view is of the first century, the belief of one trained in Jewish thought and in the ideas of a Græco-Oriental city like Tarsus; and it is not easy to understand it. Many of us, who catch eagerly at the idea of the 'power' that lies in the rite, hastily identify Paul's conception with later ideas of a mediæval type on the subject; but probably they do not err so far from the truth as those do who neglect altogether the power which he attributes to the sacred rite, and see in it a mere symbolic and occasional reminiscence of the Lord's death.

One who reads chap. 11 too superficially might readily understand from v.[17] that Paul thought of the rite only in that fashion, as a memory and testimony of 'the Lord's death.' But underneath that verse lies the whole transcendent and supreme potentiality which Paul knew to exist in the fact of that death. The Lord's death was to Paul the essential and overpowering fact in the force of the Faith, *i.e.* it was the triumphant display in a form that men's senses could appreciate of the Divine power over all the falsities and shams and outward show of the world.

The account in chap. 10 must therefore always be read along with that in 11, as indeed it necessarily would be fresh in the mind of the reader who takes the Epistle as a continuous letter, and does not cheat himself by reading 11 apart from 10. The two accounts are closely united. They form part of the treatment of one subject; and the view which is most prominently put in 10 is repeated in 12[12] under another image: 'As the body is one and hath many members . . . so also is Christ, for in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'

It is through the first account, then, unliteral and regardless of order and sequence in time as it is, that we gather better what Paul saw in the Eucharist—the triumph of spirit over matter, the reality of spirit, the unreality of matter, the absolute oneness of the Church in spite of apparent division in space. The rite is a method of lifting men for the moment so that they can regard the world and human life on the plane of eternal truth and reality—so that they can be in the Spirit and forget the material conditions which obscure the spiritual reality.

The importance of these references to the Eucharist in the early history of Christianity is incalculable. Without them it would appear from Paul's other letters that he attached small consequence to the rite; and the teaching of John would be separated by an apparently impassable gulf from that of the Synoptics. Paul makes the bridge once and for all in this Epistle; and yet it is only, in a sense, accidental that he mentions the subject. A question and a difficulty suggested the explanation. It is an excellent example of the valuelessness of the argument *a silentio*. But for a chance, we should have been ignorant of Paul's views. We should be slow, therefore, in arguing that Mark failed to perceive the power that Paul saw in the rite. Did Mark intend to explain his views and beliefs on this matter? If he did not, his silence means nothing.

[1] *Hist. Comm. on Galatians*, p. 305.

[2] Three years I believe to be the probable length of the interval between the two events.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION XXI. 5.

'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.'—R.V.

I.

THE SPEAKER.

1. The Speaker is God the Father. Throughout the whole Book of Revelation, says Swete, 'He that sitteth on the throne' is the Almighty Father, as distinguished from the Incarnate Son. And so it is probable that here for the first time in the book we listen to the words of God Himself, for it is the first time that 'He that sitteth on the throne' is represented as speaking. His words go to the centre of things and reach to their circumference, and they are gracious in their purpose: 'Behold, I make all things new.'

2. Is there a difficulty in the representation of the Father as Judge supreme? The doctrine seems to join issue with Jn 5^{21}, 'For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son'; and indeed with the whole current of early Christian tradition. Swete finds a possible reconciliation of the two views in the oneness of the Father and the Son (Jn 10^{30})—when the Son acts, the Father acts with and through Him (Jn 5^{19}). St. Paul speaks of the judgment-seat of Christ (2 Co 5^{10}), and also of the judgment-seat of God (Ro 14^{10}).

It would seem as if the threefold Personality had become united in one name. No more we hear of 'Let *us* make,' we are now confronted by an intenser term, 'Behold, *I* make all things new.' It would seem as if each Person in the Divine Trinity had times of special expression and times of special relation to nature and to man and to providence and to destiny; now it is the Father; and the other Persons of the Trinity are concealed, as it were, behind His glory: now it is the Son, the only-begotten Son, the Saviour of the world: and, finally, it is the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, who rules the whole mystery of human development. And what if now the Three should in a peculiar and definite sense be One—as if the Three-One should all be speaking in, 'Behold, I make all things new.'[1]

II.

THE PLACE OF THE PROMISE.

There are three texts which should be taken together:

[1] J. Parker, *The City Temple Pulpit*, i. 4.

'And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good' (Gn 1^{31}).

'For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together (RVm 'with us') until now' (Ro 8^{22}).

'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new' (Rev 21^{5}).

God's world is the subject of these three verses. The first describes God's world as it was; the second, God's world as it is; the third, God's world as it shall be.

1. *God's world as it was when He made it.* The report of it is—and it is God's own report—that it was very good. It could not be improved. It was perfect. God's eye saw no flaw in it. God was satisfied and delighted with it. It was all glory and beauty, music and song, happiness and peace. The Greek word for 'world' contains the idea of order. Nothing was out of place in God's world. But the word 'very good' has more than a material and more than an artistic meaning. It is a moral word. It means that there was a contrast between the world as God made it and the world as it afterwards became. It means that there was no sin in God's world as He made it.

2. *God's world as it is.* It is no longer very good. Ichabod is written across the face of it. Its glory has departed. Not that the primal order has become pure chaos. God 'in his heaven' has been working in the world from the beginning until now. Wherever His hand is not interfered with by the will of man there is order still. Nature is even continually restoring the beauty that man has defaced. It is the moral world and all that depends upon it, the sphere in which the will of man works, that has suffered an eclipse. For sin has entered, and with sin death: the first a murder, the last a suicide. 'Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people' (Jer 9^{1}). 'God's in His heaven'; but it is prophecy, not history, to say 'All's right with the world.'

3. *God's world as it shall be.* The first thing is that God is to come down and dwell in it. His tabernacle is with men, and He will dwell with them. The next, that He will recognize and

be recognized by His people. They shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God. And the third thing is that death and sorrow and pain shall be no more. But how is it that these three things are brought to pass? They are brought to pass through 'the blood of the Lamb.' There has been a sacrifice made for sin and uncleanness, and the sacrifice has taken away sin. When He said, 'It is finished,' He made an end of sin, and opened the way for God to dwell amongst men, opened the way for their reconciliation and fellowship, for the removal of all the things that follow in the path of sin.

III.

Newness not Novelty.

It is not a new world; it is the old world made new. It is not creation; it is redemption. God has not destroyed the world, to begin again; He has renewed the inhabitants of the old world in the spirit of their minds.

There are two words in the original which are necessarily translated alike—'new'—in our versions. Of these two adjectives, one signifies *new* (νέος) in relation to *time*, the other *new* in relation to *quality* (καινός)—the first temporal novelty, the second novelty intellectual or spiritual. The first indicates that which is young, recent in time; the other that which not only succeeds something else in time, but which in idea springs out of it, and not only succeeds but supersedes it.[1]

So this word, 'I make all things new,' is not the announcement of a perfectly new thing; it does not proclaim an act at that moment done; it is not an exercise, as it were, of instantaneous Omnipotence. This is the completing and the perfecting, rather, of the work of the long ages, the seal of a mighty progression, the top-stone of the great temple, the finishing of the work of the Sabbath of God from the periods of the First Creation.[2]

To make things new is not the same as to make new things. To make new things is the work of the hand; to make things new is the work of the heart. Whenever one sits upon the throne of the heart, all things are made new. They are made so without changing a line, without altering a feature. Enthrone in your heart an object of love, and you have renewed the universe. You have given an added note to every bird, a fresh joy to every brook, a fairer tint to every flower.[3]

[1] W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, 284.
[2] D. Wright, *The Power of an Endless Life*, 257.
[3] G. Matheson, *Times of Retirement*, 92.

IV.

The Evidence of the Newness.

1. The first evidence will be *the death-blow of evil.* What are the present evils under which the creation groans and travails? Suffering is one. It is Stoicism, not Christianity, that says suffering is no evil. Sickness and weakness are evils; feebleness of hand and step; toil and want; old age, solitary and begrudged and despised; sorrow and crying, not to be comforted because the loved one is not. All these things will depart on that day, because that will be the execution-day of sin.[4]

2. The second evidence of the renovation will be *the re-instalment of God.* The Seer saw no temple therein. Why? Because the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. He saw no sun. Why? Because the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. What is the occasion of sickness? It is because the Healer is absent from the earth. Of Death? Because the Life-giver is not at hand. Of loneliness? Because sin has taken away our Lord. But thine eye shall see the King in His beauty, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.[5]

V.

The Results of the Newness.

1. The 'far-off' brought nigh. He who was a stranger to God becomes a child in his Father's house. An heir of God, a joint-heir with Jesus Christ. When John Wesley was dying, in a brief moment of returning consciousness, he asked, 'What was the text that I preached upon last Sunday?' And when one standing beside him repeated, 'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor that ye through His poverty might become rich,' he exclaimed, 'Yes; that is it. There is no other.'

A modest, gentle, kindly business man once stood before me with shining eyes, telling of the joy that had come to him as the result of his giving himself in middle life to the Lord. 'To think,' he said, 'that for more than twenty years I have tried to do this for myself and could not; and now in one hour the Lord has done it for me.'[6]

2. Bitterness turned into blessing. A wonderful sentence comes to us from the Middle Ages. Out

[4] C. J. Vaughan, *Family Prayer and Sermon Book*, i. 124.
[5] C. J. Vaughan, *ibid.* 125.
[6] H. A. Stimson, *The New Things of God*, 14.

of the turmoil, the vice and the bloodshed of the Florence of that day, we hear the voice of the great poet as he says in his immortal words: 'In sua voluntade è nostra pace' ('In the doing of His will lies our peace'). How did Dante know that? Has any thought risen higher than that through all the centuries? In the doing of God's will, the surrendering of ourselves to His appointment, the accepting of the cup because He sent it, is not only the discipline we need, not only the promise of strength and attainment, but, far more than this, the peace, the deep abiding divine peace of the soul.

In a Christian Conference one of the speakers during an interval pointed out to his neighbour a man in the audience. Once a notorious drunkard, he said, for a year he has been so changed that it is like a transformation. 'And do you see that lad?' he asked. 'That is his son. I met him one day on the street, and I said, "Well, Willie, how are you getting on now?" "Oh, splendid!" he said. "Oor hame's juist like a magic lantern since faither stoppit drinkin'!"'

3. The unproductive become fruitful. The promise is, 'Ye shall bear much fruit.' This is to be the measure and the reward of a true discipleship. This is Christ's reward. This is how He is to see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied. There is that in every heart which responds to this thought. We can all understand something of the feeling of the farmer leaning on his gate and looking at the waving fields of grain about him. He has planted and cultivated and waited for the harvest, and here it is. He has made the waste land fruitful, and his soul is filled with a supreme satisfaction. Look at the light in the face of the young father over his new-born child, or the joy of the mother as for the first time she presses her infant to her heart. Life has produced life. Fruitfulness has come, the blessed gift of God. We all know its significance; even the dullest and weariest long for its privileges.[1]

Sir Wilfrid Lawson the elder (father of the late baronet), on reaching middle life, had a dangerous illness; and when brought (as he thought) to death's door, and when the unseen realities of the eternal world seemed breaking upon him, he longed for religious instruction, guidance, and consolation. This he did not expect to find among the worldly or sporting parsons of the neighbouring parishes, and so he sent for a humble Presbyterian minister from the neighbouring hamlet of Blennerhasset—a Mr. Walton—who by his instructions and prayers, by God's blessing, brought peace of mind to Sir Wilfrid, so that when he rose from his sick-bed it was with a new view of life and a new purpose in living. In a word, he had become a true earnest Christian upon personal inquiry and conviction, and his tastes and inclinations and aims were completely changed, and he determined henceforth to spread those views of truth that had changed and blessed him, by devoting time and thought and means to their diffusion among his neighbours and friends. Having obtained a peace of mind never known before, he was anxious that those around should share the same priceless treasure. The Scriptures were a new revelation to him, and with strong faith in Jesus Christ as a loving, ever-present Saviour, he felt constrained by example and word and walk to lead others to trust in and serve Him.[2]

[1] H. A. Stimson, *The New Things of God*, 19.

VI.

The Extent of it.

The words of the Seer are suggested by Is $43^{18.19}$: 'Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold, I will do a new thing.' But, says Swete, the scope of the old prophecy is enlarged indefinitely by the words 'all things.' All the fruits of the New Covenant are included.

1. Man is included. The new world begins in the human heart, and it occupies every part of the personality, and every aspect of the life. By his words a man is now justified. His thoughts are brought into captivity to the mind of Christ. Moreover, the newness covers the relation between man and man. There will be the fulfilment of both commandments—the first and greatest, and also the second which is like unto it.

Dr. Parker said in New York: 'God and one man could make any other religion, but it takes God and two men to make Christianity! The pulpit, as I say, has forgotten that two men were necessary. It has talked of the relations of God to the individual soul, and it has dealt with the supreme command to love God supremely; but it has forgotten that the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is simply the application of the same law to man in his manward relation, and that it has precisely the same origin and precisely the same sanctions as the other command. If one is binding, both are binding. If the Church is under obligations to teach the world the love of God, it is under like obligations to teach and to exemplify the love of our fellow-men. We have thought of Christianity, the teachings of Christ, as a circle drawn round the individual as its centre. Hereafter we must think of Christianity, the teachings of Jesus, as an ellipse drawn round the individual and society as two foci. Jesus laid down certain social laws for the Kingdom as a society. He laid down certain social laws to which we shall have occasion to return later.'[3]

[2] G. W. E. Russell, *Life of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*.

[3] J. Strong, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxvi. 18.

When the organist Mr. John Zundel was converted and came into the church, he said to me one morning, 'It seems that everything in the world is new. Last night I prayed; but not as you do.' I asked him what he meant, and he answered: 'I do not speak my prayers.' 'Well,' I asked, 'how do you pray?' 'On the piano always,' said he. That was true. He would sit down at his piano when in a worshipping mood, shut his eyes, and pray with his fingers. I did not wonder at it when I heard his music.[1]

2. The whole creation is included. For 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.' Change the man, and you change his world. The new self will make all around it as good as new, though no actual change should pass on it; for, to a very wonderful extent, a man creates his own world. We project the hue of our own spirit on things outside. A bright and cheerful temper sees all things on their sunny side. A weary, uneasy mind drapes the very earth in gloom. Lift from a man his load of inward anxiety, and you change the aspect of the universe to that man; for, if 'to the pure all things are pure,' it is no less true that to the happy all things are happy.[2]

Dr. S. Reynolds Turner, who superintends a Chinese colporteur in Amoy, writes: 'He is one of the most earnest Christians I have met in China, and a real red-hot evangelist. In visiting our stations I have seen a good deal of him on his native heath, and one remark he made sticks to me, since it was so strange from a Chinaman. We were standing on a hillside overlooking the sea, which at that part of the coast is dotted over with islands, and I was revelling in the beauty of the scene under a bright sun and clear skies. Suddenly he turned to me, and said, "Isn't it beautiful?" I agreed heartily, but added that I thought Chinamen did not, as a rule, pay attention to such things. "Ah!" he said, "I never saw anything about me, or thought anything beautiful or worth looking at, until I became a Christian; but since then the world gets daily more beautiful, and the more I see of it the more I comprehend our dear Father in heaven."'[3]

I remember, as though it were yesterday, something that happened in my own life at least thirty-seven years ago. I was a boy, and there came to my father's house a young man who had been brought to Christ in some services my father had been conducting away up among the Welsh hills. This young man one day was out in our garden, and talking to me about all sorts of things. He interested me as a child, and I loved him. Suddenly he stooped down and took a leaf from a nasturtium plant, put it on his hand, and said to me, 'Did you ever see anything so beautiful?' And I looked, and saw all the veins, and the exquisite beauty of it all. Then he said, 'Do you know, I never saw how beautiful that leaf was until six months ago, when I gave myself to Christ?' I have never forgotten that. How true I know that to be in my own experience![4]

But the change is not only in the man himself. Creation recognizes the change in him and responds. Where he leads, it follows. If he mourns, it will lament. If he pipes to it, it will dance.

Some travellers once vainly tried to awaken a wonderful echo. Then a rough bugler by the roadside played a simple scale down the instrument. At once the echo answered. The hills sounded far and farther off as if with church bells, peal on peal, chime on chime, until they who had listened almost wept to lose that silver music in the enchanted distance. Let us play the simple old scale. All the magic is in the echo. That makes the old sounds new.[5]

Literature.

G. Matheson, *Times of Retirement*, 92; W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, 284; J. Parker, *The City Temple Pulpit*, i. 2; J. Oswald Dykes, *Sermons*, 249; H. A. Stimson, *The New Things of God*, 9; D. Wright, *The Power of an Endless Life*, 255; C. J. Ellicott, *The Destiny of the Creature*, 77; J. Parker, *Studies in Texts*, iii. 151; C. J. Vaughan, *The Family Prayer and Sermon Book*, i. 121; G. Hunsworth, *Light in the Gloom*, 37; M. F. Sadler, *Sermon Outlines for the Clergy and Lay Preachers*, 84; A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, vol. vi. 17; E. M. Dewhurst, *The King and His Servants*, 59; R. E. Hutton, *The Crown of Christ*, ii. 75; *The Preacher's Magazine* (1897), 27 (W. Wakinshaw); *The Church Pulpit Year Book* (1906) 33, (1910) 5; *The Christian World Pulpit*, x. 168 (G. W. M'Cree), lxvi. 17 (J. Strong), lxvii. 86 (Kirsopp Lake).

[1] H. W. Beecher, *Lectures on Preaching*, 72.
J. Oswald Dykes, *Sermons*, 261.
[2] *Report of B. and F. Bible Society*, 1906.
[3] Dr. Campbell Morgan, in *British Weekly*, 1909.
[4] W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, 307.

Crete, the Jordan, and the Rhône.

By J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., Woodbrooke Settlement, Birmingham.

The advanced culture of the early settlers in Crete, and the influence of Cretan civilization upon the rest of the Mediterranean, are becoming every day more recognized. It is interesting, therefore, to pick up any threads of history or tradition which may enable us to connect the Cretan civilization with its mysterious origins on the one hand, or with the later civilizations on the other hand, which may have come under its influence. In this regard it was worthy of note that Fick has recently in his study of Greek Place-names of the first period (*Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, Göttingen, 1905), made the suggestion that the civilization of the Rhône valley was due, in the first instance, to Cretans. We are all aware how early was the Hellenic influence in Southern Gaul, and how constantly the first settlements were reinforced from Greece and from Asia Minor; but the origin of the colonization is commonly referred to the Phocæans, who begin the long chain of influence that continues to the days of Pothinus, Irenæus, and the Churches of Smyrna and elsewhere in Asia Minor.[1] The reason why Fick threw out the suggestion that the Cretans were in Southern Gaul before the Phocæans was due to his recognition of a Cretan affinity in the name of Marseilles.

'The name of the river Massalia, which flows into the sea on the south-west of Middle Crete between Cape Psychion and the little coast-town Lamos (see Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland*, ii. 547), reminds one forcibly of Massalia-Marseilles, the city settled by the Phocæans. This can hardly be an accident. In that case the Cretans will have discovered and settled at the mouths of the Rhône before the Phocæans.'

Fick goes on to suggest that the same thing has happened in Corsica, where original Cretan settlements underlie the colonies of the Phocæans. The suggestion is an extremely interesting one, and sets one thinking: for it is clear that if the Cretans are in the Rhône valley before the Phocæans and later bodies of Greek immigrants, we ought to find further traces of them in the nomenclature of this part of Gaul. For example, Fick, in discussing the early Cretan names to the east of Gortyna, stumbles upon a place to the east of Vinatos (Ἴνατος), which Stephanus the Geographer calls by the name of Βίεννος. Fick corrects the spelling to Βίαννος, shows from the inscriptions that the people who live there are called Βίαννοι, and identifies the place with a little village which now bears the name Viano. He suggests further that the double *n* is for an original *nd*, and finds a parallel in the name of a little town called Βιάνδινα ἢ Βιανδίνου πόλις on the promontory of Taenarum at the southern extremity of the Peleponnese. The suggestion at once arose in my mind that we had here a name that was exactly parallel to the name of Vienne in Southern Gaul, one of the great cities of Roman and Pre-Roman times. It is curious that Fick, who was so ready to recognize the Cretan origin of Marseilles, does not seem to have suspected this parallel. But it had already been pointed out by Stephanus, who has the actual tradition that Vienna was a Cretan colony from Viennus in Crete.[2] And since Dion Cassius (xlvi. 50) says that the Allobroges (whose chief city Vienna is) had expelled some previous settlers, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that these were the Cretans, who suffered some reverse here in the days of their early colonization. I had not seen the reference in Stephanus, in making the connexion between the Cretan Βίαννος and the Greek Οὐϊέννα.

[1] Justin. 43. 3, 6: 'Itaque Phocæenses in ultimam Oceani oram procedere ausi, in sinum Gallicum circum ostia Rhodani amnis devenere.'

[2] Stephanus' statement is as follows:—

Biennos, *a city of Crete*: some say that it takes its name from Biennos, one of the Curetes; others, that it is named after the violent deed (Βίας) done in the matter of Ares, which they say was here done by Otus and Ephialtus, the sons of Poseidon; and even to the present day the murder-hecatombs are here sacrificed to Ares.

The citizens are called Bienni; but some say that they pay dues to Zeus Temilios and to Biennios. There is also *another city of the name in Gaul*; for when once upon a time a pestilence had seized on Crete, the inhabitants migrated elsewhere, and some occupied Hydruntum, a city of Italy not yet enclosed. And an oracle was given them, that they should colonize the most marshy place they could find. So they came to a marshy place on the Rhône, a river of Gaul, and dwelt there, and named their city Bianna, because one of the young women in their party, named Bianna, was swallowed up in a chasm while dancing; and this city is commemorated by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*.

The tradition that one of the virgins who migrated with them, named herself Bianna, was swallowed up in a chasm, is, probably, only an afterthought to explain away the fact that the city of Vienne, like so many famous cities of the East, was built upon a sacrifice at the corner-stone in the shape of a young virgin, who becomes the Fortune of the city. Stephanus gives her name correctly as Bianna.

I venture to suggest, then, that Stephanus was right when he said that Vienne had been founded by the Cretans. The name of the original settlement was perhaps Βίανδος.

If we have correctly followed the suggestions of Fick in regard to the Cretan colonization of the Rhône Valley, we ought certainly to go a step further and ask whether other traces of Cretan occupation can be detected. The names, to be conclusive, should be Pre-Hellenic as well as Cretan, for the Cretan settlers are to be the first in the field at Marseilles, unless, perhaps, we are to allow for a Phœnician Colony. The first question, then, that arises is as to the name of the river itself that flows between the two Cretan settlements, Marseilles and Vienne. It used to be supposed that the name was genuine Greek, and that it had been given to the river by settlers from the Island of Rhodes in remembrance of the Island of Roses, from which they had come. But this opinion has generally been abandoned, and it appears to be a conflict to-day between those who hold that the name is Ligurian, and those who take it to be Celtic. Leaving, for the present, the philological question between Ligurian and Celtic, let us turn to the pre-Hellenic rivers in Crete, and see what they offer that is in any way similar to the name of the Rhône (Ῥοδανός).

We immediately light upon a curious problem which becomes more and more perplexing and at the same time interesting, as we examine it.

The most important river in Western Crete is the Ἰάρδανος or Ἰαρδάνης; the form of the name suggests at once that we are dealing with Pre-Hellenic or non-Hellenic matter. On this river, according to the Odyssey, lived the Kydones:

Ἔνθα Κύδωνες ἔναιον Ἰαρδάνου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα
(*Od.* γ. 292).

And it was not unnatural that early critics of the geography of this passage thought they had come upon a certain trace of Semitic influence, and identified the river's name with that of the Jordan, thus making the Kydones a Semitic people, or, at all events, explaining the nomenclature by Semitic influence. But to this there are grave objections. First of all, there are other rivers whose names agree very closely with the Cretan Jardanos. One of them, according to the *Iliad*, is in Elis:

Φειᾶς παὰρ τείχεσσιν Ἰαρδάνου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα
(*Il.* H. 135);

another is in Lydia, for Stephanus of Byzantium says—

Ἰάρδανος πόταμος Λυδίας;

and Fick points out that this must be correct because in the Lydian Mythology Ἰάρδανος (the river-god?) is the father of the Lydian Mother-goddess Omphale.[1]

It is natural, then, to connect the Cretan river with these two other Jordans, and not with the Palestinian; and this seems to exclude Semitic influence altogether.

The problem becomes, however, more interesting, when we discover that Semitic scholars are in serious doubt whether the name of the Jordan is itself Semitic.

Setting aside the early patristic explanation that the name is made up out of two Hebrew words, *yor*, יור, which means 'river' (? the Nile), and *Dan*, an explanation which turns up in all sorts of odd corners of the Patristic Literature, we have the best explanation of the word in the stem *yarad* ('to descend'), from a primitive *warad*, the name being very appropriate on account of its rapid descent from its sources near Mt. Hermon to the Dead Sea. But even to this apparently satisfactory derivation objections have been taken, and Stade, in his *Hebrew Grammar*, gives reasons for rejecting it. If it is not Semitic, what is it? Can it be Hittite? In that case the other three Jordans, of which one is definitely Lydian, may belong with it. Moreover, in that case, there will be a fifth river that will have to be grouped with them. For the suggestion made above of the existence of the collateral Hebrew forms *yarad* and *warad* may be valid elsewhere than in Hebrew. And there is, according to Ptolemy, a river on the Black Sea, whose name is Vardanes; it is a branch of the Atticitus river in Sarmatia (Ptol. v. 9, 28). This river can hardly be detached from the other four.

[1] She is called Iardanis, the nymph, in Ovid. *Her.* 103.

So here are five rivers, at least, from some unknown language which has yet to be identified.

My next observation is that the name Vardon, upon which we have stumbled, is the name of two of the tributaries of the Rhône. Every one knows the *Pont de Gard* near Avignon, and those who are acquainted with French Philology (which makes *guerre* out of *war*, and *garde* out of *ward*) will recognize in the Gard or Gardon an earlier Ward or Wardon. There are two streams of the name Gard, the Gardon d'Alais, and the Gardon d'Anduze, which coalesce and flow into the Rhône below the Pont du Gard. The original name of the stream was Vardo or Vardon.[1]

Now this name agrees closely with the forms that we have already been studying, both in Crete and in Asia Minor, and on the Black Sea, so that I do not hesitate to label it as Cretan, and as the name given by the early settlers from that island. Counting the two Vardons as a single stream, we have now six rivers belonging to the same group.

If, however, Vardon is the right name for one of the upper branches of the Rhône, the inference is, at least, a probable one that this is the original form for the Rhodanus itself, which has been preserved in its upper waters. We have an instructive parallel in the name of the river Thames, which is a combination, or, as Spenser would say, the result of a marriage between the Thames and Isis. The combination represents a later date than the two original names, and it is easy to infer that the name of Thame once held right down to the sea. Even in Milton's time, the Thames at Windsor could be spoken of as 'royal-towered Thame.'[2]

Now, apart altogether from the meaning or origin of the name Ἰάρδανος, it is difficult to resist the suggestion of some connexion between the name *Vardon* and the name *Rhodanus*; and any explanation of the similarity of the names requires that Vardon should be the older form. But this brings us again so close to the *Jardanos* group and the associated Sarmatian *Vardanes*, that we are almost obliged to take them all together and look for a common etymological origin.[3] This means, that we must connect the Rhône, as well as the cities on its banks, with the primitive Cretan migration, and have no need to resort to Ligurian or Celtic derivations. The name may have undergone Gallicization, it was not originally Celtic.

Then we have to inquire further into the supposed Cretan ancestry and the meaning of the name. Those who derived the name of the Gallic river from Rhodes and its assumed settlers, and from the rose which is the symbol of the island, had a difficulty to face in the fact that no one knows the origin of the name Rhodes, nor to what language the Greek word ῥόδον originally belongs. The Armenian for *rose* is *vard*, and the Arabic is *ward*, but it does not seem to be a Semitic stem.[4]

The Armenian language has probably borrowed it from somewhere; the source, for example, might be Hittite, if Hittite were different from primitive Armenian.

Whatever be the origin, we may be sure that changes which made a primitive *ward* into a Greek ῥόδον would not contradict a similar connexion between *Warden* and *Rhodanos*. The discovery of the collateral Vardon in the upper waters of the Rhône helps our identification greatly; and at all events we see clearly in what direction to look for the origin of the divergent names of the river. It is even possible that Rhodanus might, after all, mean 'Rosy.'

We have now followed out Fick's suggestions so far as to detect early Cretan influence in the names of Marseilles, of Vienna, of Vardon and the Pont du Gard, and of the Rhône itself. The ultimate source may be Hittite, but of that we only know enough to say, that the less said dogmatically about an undeciphered language the better. There is

[1] So in Sidonius Apollinaris, p. 50: "Siquidem domibus medius it Vuardo fluvius, nisi cum deflua nive pastus impalluit flavis ruber glareis, et per alveum perspicuus, quietus, calculosusque, neque ob hoc minus piscium ferax delicatorum.'

[2] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, iv. 11, 24.

So went he playing on the watery plaine,
Soon after whom the lovely bridegroom came,
The noble Thamis, with all his goodly traine;
But him before there went, as best became,
His auncient parents, namely, th' auncient Thame,
But much more aged was his wife than he,
The Ouze, whom men do Isis rightly name.

[3] It is curious and amusing that Rufinus, when he tried to find a Celtic etymology for the name of the Rhône, imitated closely the old Patristic etymology of the Jordan, as follows:—*De nominibus Gallicis*, 4: '*Roth* violentiam, *dan* et in Gallico et in Hebraeo judicem; ideo *Hrodanus* iudex violentus.'

[4] One of the depressions on the road from Suez to Sinai goes by the name of the Wady Wardan; I do not know of any explanation that has ever been made of it. But it should be noted.

nothing to prevent the assignment of all the Jordan rivers of Crete, Asia Minor, Sarmatia, and Palestine, to a Hittite nomenclature, *if other evidence should point that way*. Only we must remember Mr. Andrew Lang's comments on Professor Sayce's statement that 'the Moschi seem to have spoken a language allied to that of the Cappadocians and Hittites.' 'That is to say,' says Mr. Lang, 'it is not impossible that the language of the Moschi, about which next to nothing is known, may have been allied to that of the Cappadocians, about which we know next to nothing.' 'Where Professor Sayce is, the Hittites, if we may say so respectfully, are not very far off.'

In the Study.

The Beautiful Word 'Ransom.'

One of the first sermons in the new volume of the *Christian World Pulpit*—it is the 76th volume, containing the sermons from July to December, 1909 (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.)—one of its first sermons is entitled 'The Servant-Redeemer.' The preacher is the Rev. Herbert Snell, B.A., and the text is Mt 20^{28}, 'Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

The Servant-Redeemer? Why must the Servant be a Redeemer, and why must the Redeemer be a Servant? That was the vision of Isaiah—'Behold my servant': 'and with his stripes we are healed.' It means that the redemption of man is to be accomplished by the instrumentality of God. Not against God's will; not simply with God's acquiescence; but in full harmony with God's purpose and under God's direction. The Redeemer is to be God's servant, the instrument of His hand, used by God for our healing. But redemption is the payment of a price. It is wounding; it is stripes. The servant must also be a sufferer. 'Suffering goodness,' says Mr. Snell, 'is an equivalent for the service of God.'

It is a mighty truth. How did Isaiah attain to it? Not by quiet thinking, but by the pressure of experience. 'Just as diamonds are generally discovered in the beds of rivers flowing through volcanic districts, the product of stupendous pressure during awful eruptions, so this gem originated in that wild chaotic period of Israel's history when she was the captive of tyranny and of idolatry, when empires clashed in conflict around her prison walls, and buried her destiny in hopeless débris.'

He came as a Servant. So every man of genius or of greatness comes as the servant of man. Did He come, like Plato, to serve to intellectual progress? Did He come, like Luther, for the reformation of doctrine? Did He come, like Cromwell, for political reconstruction? Did He come, like Shakespeare, for the culture of the imagination in poetic and dramatic ideals? He came as a Servant in order to redeem man. And for that end no one ever came but Himself.

But He was a Physician. He healed all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. He did not heal as a physician; He healed as a Redeemer. His service to the sick of the palsy was not 'Rise up and walk,' but 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'

But He came as a Teacher. Did they not say, 'Never man spake like this man.' He did not teach as a Rabbi, but as a Redeemer. 'The Sermon on the Mount, with its sublime precepts, its ravishing melody of language, would yet never have led captive the mind and heart of man but for the Cross. We all remember Holman Hunt's famous picture of the carpenter's shop in Nazareth with the mother of Jesus bending over the chest containing the gifts of the wise men, and the young carpenter stretching his arms above his head in weariness, while his shadow, the shadow of a cross, shows behind Him on the wall. If I get close to the Sermon on the Mount and examine it, I see there the shadow of the cross on every page.'

'He gave his life a ransom.' Ransom is a beautiful word. Mr. Snell says so. And that says much for Mr. Snell. By our words we shall be justified—by the words we speak, and also by the words we love. How are you drawn to the word 'blood,' for instance? How are you drawn to the

word 'ransom'? Mr. Snell says it is a beautiful word.

But he does not play with it. He seeks to discover its meaning. 'It was a word in ordinary and everyday use among the Hebrews. In every Jewish family, if the firstborn was a boy, the father "ransomed" him, when he was thirty days old, from the service of the sanctuary by paying five shekels to the priest. That money was "ransom." It permitted him to follow that trade or profession to which opportunity or natural bent inclined him.'

Mr. Snell gives this illustration:

'In George Eliot's *Romola*, Baldasarre, the slave, gave gems to his adopted son, Tito Melema, that he might ransom him. But that young man, wishing to live a life of pleasure, and make for himself a secure nest in the world, preferred to sell the gems for his own profit. On one occasion, Bardo, Romola's blind father, asked to be allowed to handle them, but Tito said, "They are in the safe keeping of a goldsmith, who has strong and safe places for such things: he estimates them as worth at least 500 ducats." "Ah, then, they are fine gems," said Bardo, "500 ducats! Ah! more than a man's ransom." It was a mere phrase of common parlance, at a time when men were often being ransomed from slavery or imprisonment, but it smote like a knife on Tito's conscience, for they *were* a man's ransom, though he did not intend to use them as such.'

Jesus Christ came into the world bringing with Him priceless gems, all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. In Him was all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. But He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. He poured out His wealth in the redeeming of sinful men. He spent His jewels on our ransom.

Was He ever tempted to use them for Himself? Yes, that is the meaning of the battle in the wilderness. 'If thou art the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread'—spend thy jewels to satisfy thy hunger. 'If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down'—give them for admiration and personal éclat. 'If thou wilt fall down and worship me, all shall be thine'—barter them for the empire of the world. But He said no. No, He said, I cannot; they are ransom. 'The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'

'Give the world all credit for the noble impulses that now and again run through the arteries of its moral life, but what does the world need to-day, to lift the burden of its misery, so much as Christ's redeeming love?

'Oft when the Word is on me to deliver, lifts the illusion, and the truth lies bare;
Only like souls I see the folk thereunder, bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,—
Hearing their one hope with an aching wonder, sadly contented in a show of things:—
Then with a rush the intolerable craving shivers throughout me like a trumpet call,
Oh, to save these! to perish for their saving,
Die for their life, be offered for them all!'

Two Studies in Ritschlianism.

A new book on Ritschlianism is a blessing. Two new books are an embarrassment. They are both by Cambridge men. They are identical in size and in price. It is only a careful reading, first of one and then of the other, that brings out their difference and shows it necessary to read them both. Look at them separately.

Mr. John Kenneth Mozley, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, has given to his volume the simple title of *Ritschlianism* (Nisbet; 5s. net). He has dedicated it to Professor Herrmann of Marburg, 'in gratitude for much personal kindness received, and in recognition of all that he has done to establish the true meaning and significance of Christian Faith.' We judge accordingly that the book is to be sympathetic to the Ritschlians, and we judge rightly. It is also sympathetic to Ritschlianism, though not so sympathetic.

That is the very point of view which Mr. Mozley takes up. Ritschl and his followers deserve utmost gratitude for their good intention. They realized the existence of a situation that was critical for Christianity, and they honestly attempted to meet it and supply what was needed. The gravity of that situation is not yet fully understood, and consequently Ritschlianism has been judged too exclusively on its own merits, as if it were a defence of Christianity without date or country, and so it has been found wanting. But when the Church comes to realize that there was in Ritschl's day a considerable body of thinking men who were divorced from Christianity because of the intellectual difficulties it presented, she will recognize

the honesty and ability of the Ritschlian attempt to meet that serious situation, and will be more patient of its partial failure.

For it has partly failed. Mr. Mozley takes up the great characteristic questions one by one and expounds them—the Ritschlian attitude to Philosophy, Religion and the Idea of God, Revelation, the Value-Judgments, Faith, Communion with God. The exposition is also a criticism. And then he sums up the matter in one concluding chapter, and weighs Ritschlianism in the balance.

First of all, what has Ritschlianism done to commend Christianity to the unbeliever? What is its contribution to Apologetic? For a moment the separation of theology from philosophy seems a great gain. It did seem so for a moment. But what was the result? The philosopher (and in a degree the scientist) simply found himself outside. The apology proved to be addressed only to the believer, who, being a believer, did not need an apology. 'The duty of Christian Apologetic,' says Mr. Mozley, 'is twofold—to show that the facts with which the origin of Christianity is bound up are true facts and not inventions; and secondly, to demonstrate the inherent reasonableness of the Christian religion, and its relation to the presentations of reasons from other quarters. The Ritschlians have not carried out these tasks, though, perhaps, an exception should be made in the case of Harnack, who is at once sympathetic in his attitude towards other religions, and keenly interested in the evangelistic mission of the Church.'

Next, what has Ritschlianism done for Christian piety? It has separated piety from sentimentalism. And that is a great good. For 'Jesusolatry,' as Hort called it, is a danger to which 'Catholics' and 'Evangelicals' are equally liable. This form of religiousness was closely studied by the Ritschlians, and they opposed it by restoring the New Testament conception of faith, and giving it the supremacy over love, laying stress on the unity and redeeming might of the Person of Jesus Christ, and teaching that religion is concerned with the performance of duties in this world and not with states of feeling. But the Ritschlians went wrong when they went so far as to denounce all mysticism and deny the claim of any man to have communion with the exalted Christ.

Lastly, what has been the contribution of Ritschl to systematic theology? He views Christian doctrine from the point of view of the two foci—Justification by Faith and the Kingdom of God. And the estimate we make of these two centres will depend on what we are. To the Lutheran—such a Lutheran as Ritschl—the weight he hangs on Justification by Faith will not seem excessive. To the Christian social reformer, it will not seem possible to make too much of the idea of the Kingdom of God.

But the Ritschlian contribution to theology is judged not on these great central ideas so much as on its separate parts. What is its doctrine of Christ? Here there has been much dispute among its critics. Mr. Mozley sees that Ritschl could not possibly have constructed a satisfactory doctrine of the Godhead of Christ because he rejected the category of substance. But he says, 'Even if *we* feel that the neglect of this category amounts logically to a denial of Christ's substantial Deity, we ought not to impute this to the Ritschlians. To speak of Ritschl, Herrmann, and Kaftan as Unitarians is a real abuse of language.'

What, then, of the Atonement? Ritschl's doctrine of the Atonement, says Mr. Mozley, is more genuinely Socinian than his doctrine of Christ's Deity. But that is not the criticism which we usually hear. For 'it is a curious fact,' Mr. Mozley continues, 'that there are many thinkers who would pride themselves on their orthodoxy and attachment to Catholic principles, and shrink with horror from Socinianism where it touches the doctrine of the Incarnation, who yet view with favour an application of thoroughly Socinian and rationalistic principles to the doctrine of the Atonement. But it was the Atonement and not the Incarnation which Socinianism first assailed. This attitude, so surprising in convinced Christians, is due to the belief that the Incarnation stands by itself, and that the Atonement is a mere corollary from it; whereas the true Christian method, and unquestionably the method of the New Testament, is to place the Cross in the forefront, and pass on from that to an assertion of the Divinity of Him who suffered on Calvary. It cannot be said too often that the Cross, not the manger, Calvary, not Bethlehem, is the heart of the New Testament. In England the influence of Dr. Westcott from Cambridge and of the Anglo-Catholic successors of the Tractarians from Oxford combined has tended in the opposite

direction. In the writer's judgment it is a perilous course to throw the doctrine of propitiatory Atonement to the wolves of Rationalism, while yet retaining the belief that the Incarnation can be preserved in its integrity: and it is a course against which the New Testament, as he reads it, stands opposed. We are indeed told that it is the fact of the Atonement which matters, and not theories about it; but if the saying that "Christ died for our sins" is not to be simply a shibboleth, it is impossible to refrain from asking what such an idea implies. In all effective preaching this truth that "Christ died for our sins" has been anything but an idea without positive content; and wherever the Christian Gospel has been most effective, the content of that idea has been the substitution of Christ for us in His sufferings and death.'

The title which Mr. Ernest A. Edghill, M.A., sometime Scholar of King's College, Cambridge, has given to his study of Ritschlianism is *Faith and Fact* (Macmillan; 5s. net). It is a more elementary book than Mr. Mozley's, and begins nearer the beginning. Mr. Edghill believes, and there is no doubt that he is right in believing, that Ritschlianism will never be understood except by those who come to the study of it from a knowledge of the philosophical atmosphere in which Ritschl found himself. Accordingly he devotes two chapters to an exposition of immediately preceding philosophical speculation, the first chapter being on Kant, Lange, and Lotze, the second on Schleiermacher and the Romantic School. These preliminary chapters are well written and may be read by any one with refreshing.

There follows the exposition of Ritschlianism. It is at once an exposition and a criticism. Mr. Edghill is not intensely interested in the Ritschlians. He judges the system apart from the men. But he does not judge it unsympathetically. Although for the system as a whole his judgment is condemnation, for he finds it 'impossible to accept Ritschlianism as any adequate substitute for the traditional faith of Christendom,' yet he has a good word to say for nearly every one of its separate elements, and so good a word for some of them that he is willing to accept them as they stand.

Mr. Edghill has, as we have said, a keen sense of the necessity of understanding the philosophical situation into which Ritschlianism was born. He has not so keen an apprehension of the nearer theological situation. No man can possibly understand Ritschlianism who does not recognize it as the offspring and heir of the Reformation. No man can possibly appreciate Ritschl himself who does not appreciate the Reformers. But Mr. Edghill has no interest in the Reformation. The Reformers are nothing to him. Ritschlianism, he says, claims to be the true evangelical theology. It is 'a claim we are not prepared to admit or to deny.' He is aware that Ritschl and his followers try to make clear, 'often at excessive pains,' that they are only developing Lutheran ideas. He admits that on the whole they do not make out a bad case for themselves. 'However,' he says, 'this is a question best left to those who are most qualified to deal with it, or who feel themselves chiefly concerned in the matter.' And he adds: 'The present writer is unconscious of any such vital interest, nor does he possess the necessary qualifications to decide whether the "plerophorie," with which the Ritschlians vindicate the Lutheran character for their theology is or is not justified.'

But these frank admissions must not be allowed to prejudice one against the book. There is no doubt that Mr. Edghill, like Professor Orr, estimates the value of Ritschlianism according to its conformity to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, although his idea of what the doctrine of the Catholic Church is, differs considerably from Dr. Orr's idea. Mr. Mozley, on the other hand, like Dr. Garvie, estimates its worth according to what it has done for the recovery of Christianity in our day, and the appeal it makes to the modern mind. Both estimates are necessary. It is for this reason that we say Mr. Edghill's book should be read even by those who have read Mr. Mozley's.

The Life of Faith.

By Professor the Rev. W. W. Holdsworth, Birmingham.

The Informing Spirit.

John xvi. 1–15.

We have seen that the blessedness which Christ holds out to His disciples through union with Him is the blessedness of life; and we have seen that the joy, knowledge, effective power, and readiness for suffering which follow upon our union with Him, are true issues of life. But to us men life implies a spirit within us, a spirit which really makes us capable of these effects, which gives reality to our experience, bestows upon us that balance which is right judgment, that moral sense which enables us to perceive and also stimulates us to do the right, until at last it links us to God in bonds as strong as they are unseen. We shall expect to find, then, in this new life a spirit which will give shape to our moral ideals, and enlighten while it forms,—an informing spirit whose gift shall be the threefold gift of knowledge, power, and character. And this is exactly what Christ promises. At the very centre of the life which we are to live in Him, we may find, He tells us, a Spirit sent by Him to abide, never to leave us, to be in us, to exert His power permanently at the centre of our life.

Christ has first to recall His disciples from the contemplation of their own impending loss to the great gift which should follow upon that 'going' which they deplored, but which they so little understood. He had shielded them hitherto, and the thought that that shelter was to be removed filled their hearts with sorrow. So full were they of their loss that no one asked how this departure affected Him, and thus they were in danger of missing the abiding significance of His departure for themselves. There are three words[1] for 'going away' used over and over again in these chapters, and there is a fruitful study to be found in the changes rung on these 'bells of sweet accord.' Let it suffice to say that departure from the point of view of mere separation passes into the idea of a journey, and thence into that of a goal to be reached, a 'going home.'

Christ had before Him the separation which He, no less than His disciples, would feel; but He knew that He was on His way back to the very centre and fountain of life in the bosom of the Father, and that there would proceed thence that Spirit who would give both meaning and power to life, the new life which they would live in Him. It was expedient for them that He should go away, for He was going home, their home and His, and from that source of life should issue He who would be in them and abide, He whose power we recognize within us to-day in the office and work of the Holy Spirit. What is His work? Our Lord says that it is 'to convict the world'; and so we come to verses peculiarly packed with thought. The word 'to convict'[2] (R.V.) implies authoritative examination and unquestionable proof. It means 'to bring home to' the world the true issues of the life it may be living, but it goes even further than this, as implying a power of decisive judgment and of power to enforce it when made. The subjects with which the Spirit deals cover the whole of man's spiritual experience. Past, present, and future are all before us in sin, righteousness, and judgment; and the Spirit will convince men of these because they all turn upon man's attitude to Christ, since the work of the Spirit is to take of that which Christ is,[3] and to reveal that unto us. The great test of sin

[1] ἀπέρχομαι, πορεύομαι, and ὑπάγω. So Dr. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, pp. 142 ff. This may be accepted with some reservation. The 28th verse of this chapter, in which Christ gives up the word ὑπάγω which He had previously used and reverts to the more easily understood πορεύομαι, to the great relief of the disciples (v.[29]), is strongly in favour of this interpretation. There are, however, many passages in which the word can mean nothing more than withdrawal. See especially the use of the imperative in such passages as Mt 4[10] 9[6].

[2] ἐλέγχειν. 'Places the truth of the case in a clear light before him' (Westcott).

[3] ἐκ τοῦ ἐμου λήψεται; cf. Mt 10[40], where the use of the possessive pronoun rather than the dative of the personal pronoun seems to indicate not, 'I have not the power to give,' but rather 'it does not belong to my nature to give.' If this distinction may be maintained here, this passage will show that the work of the Holy Spirit is to reveal that which Christ is in its unity.

will always be the Person of Christ. He is in Himself the dividing line which separates men. Their sin will be determined by the answer to the question, 'Do they believe upon Him?' It is in such a passage as this that the supreme importance of a true view of faith becomes apparent. Such belief as is indicated here is no mental state of acceptance or conviction; it is not a condition of mind, but an act of will which is before us in this connexion. 'To believe in Christ' is to surrender oneself to Him, and the self-esteem or the selfish obstinacy which makes a man refuse to do that is the assertion of that principle of self-will which is the root of all sin. Want of 'belief' is thus seen to be the secret principle of rebellion against God, of the 'lawlessness' which sin is.[1]

In thus bringing home to the moral consciousness of men all that we mean by 'righteousness,' the ascension of our Lord, His return to the Father, comes into view. For that 'return' completed the historical work of Christ, and in that work the kingdom of righteousness was revealed once for all. We had never known the full power of obedience, or the majesty of law, or the reality of a spiritual fellowship with God, apart from the life of Christ. Men had guessed at righteousness, had felt after it; but in the life of Christ, rounded off and completed by the return to the Father, the prototype of the divine righteousness was at last seen. As St. Paul says, it stands revealed in the gospel of Christ.[2] But this return to the Father is bound up with the sending of the Spirit; therefore He will convince by virtue of that return.

So also with judgment, that final and perfect discrimination, that separation of the tangled and conflicting elements of life, that laying bare of the secret, spiritual factor of life and thought,—the awful judgment of God, is the work of the same Spirit. For in revealing the things of Christ, He reveals that through which the Prince of this world—he in whom the spirit of the world finds its perfect embodiment—is cast out[3] and the world is judged. The standard which he had imposed is overthrown; the criterion of conduct is no longer self-interest. That has been judged.[4] Christ has in His own life assigned to that its proper place, and in doing so He has made real through the Spirit that final judgment to which we move in certain, inevitable steps. He shall lead you into 'the truth in all its parts.'[5] So run the remarkable words. They hold out to the disciples of all time that moral certainty, that assurance, that moral judgment which we need in a world of conflicting issues, of violent impulses, and of motives never at one stay. St. John was not the first to give the thought expression in literature. Before he wrote this wonderful Gospel, St. Paul had spoken of the man who should 'judge all things.' He had spoken of him as possessing the mind, the moral reason of Christ, and he had designated the man so described as 'the spiritual man.'[6] The phrase is remarkable. It does not mean the man whose thoughts turn more easily to the spiritual as distinguished from the material world; nor does it indicate merely the man with a pious turn of mind. It means the man whose spirit is in living contact with the Spirit of God. For it is in the meeting of the human with the Divine Spirit that there is given to us that moral and spiritual perception which bestows upon us the 'right judgment in all things' for which we so often pray. There is no room here for that censorious spirit so ready to proclaim and to condemn the failures of men either in thought or deed. The expression indicates rather that meek and self-distrustful spirit whose power is not of its own, but is the gift of God, and which consists of a readiness to recognize that which is of Christ as it may be made known to us by the Spirit of God. It is He who calls to us from across the gulf that separates life from life: He declares it unto us, declares it so that the message reaches and blesses our ears.[7] He does this because He is the Spirit of truth, the Spirit who gives expression to truth. And what is that truth? 'He shall take of that which is myself,' says Christ, and 'reveal that unto you.' No one can hope either to fully describe

[1] 1 Jn 3[4], ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.

[2] Ro 1[17], ἐν αὐτῷ (τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) ἀποκαλύπτεται δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. For δικαιοσύνη, see Sanday and Headlam *in loco*. The word 'covers the whole range of right action.' 'To the few it was the highest moral ideal,' etc. etc.

[3] Jn 12[31], νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω.

[4] κέκριται, perfect, 'stands judged'; cf. νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου (Jn 12[31]).

[5] εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 'Into the complete understanding of and sympathy with that absolute Truth which is Christ Himself' (Westcott).

[6] 1 Co 2[15], ὁ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα. See Edwards *in loco*.

[7] ἀναγγελεῖ.

the work of the Spirit of God, or to measure the effect of His work upon the life of man. It was more than the revelation of truth, for it was also, and more particularly, an indwelling within man of One who was God Himself. To man, unsure of purpose, bewildered by facts of life which seem to involve grave moral contradictions, affronted by the frequent and loudly vaunted triumphs of evil, what could have come with greater power—the power which lies in a full assurance of the reality and of the character of sin, righteousness, and judgment,—what could have come with greater power than the presence at the very centre of life of a Divine Person, earnest and foretaste of a greater possession still,[1] as by His presence within us we know ourselves the heirs of God.

Great is the life which comes to us by reason of that surrender of ourselves to Christ which we call 'faith.' Great are the issues of that life in joy, in knowledge, in prayer; but greatest of all is He who lives within us, life of our life, the informing Spirit, Spirit of all truth.

[1] Eph 1[14], *ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν*. Cf. Ro 8[17], *κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ*.

Literature.

THE RELIGION OF THE SIKHS.

It is not for their religion that the Sikhs are best known. They are known all over the world for their prowess in battle and for their loyalty. But the fame which they have acquired, and which is so honourable, rests ultimately upon their religion. We may not need to know what their religion is. We may need only to know that we can still rely upon Sikh fidelity if all the other races of India should prove faithless. But until the Sikhs have embraced Christianity and so are bound to Britain by that strongest and most endurable of all ties, it is right and necessary that we should know that it is their adherence to their present religion that keeps them loyal and makes them brave. It is startling to find Mr. Macauliffe advocating the establishment of the religion of the Sikhs in India by the British Government. His argument, however, is quite intelligible. For he fears that, if left to itself, the religion of the Sikhs may be swallowed up in Hinduism. And though it is improbable that the British Government will ever establish a religion again, yet if establishing a religion is likely to keep it in life, there could be found political arguments for the establishing of this one which would appeal even to a statesman like Lord Morley of Blackburn. 'Truly wonderful,' says Mr. Macauliffe, 'are the strength and vitality of Hinduism. It is like the boa-constrictor of the Indian forests. When a petty enemy appears to worry it, it winds round its opponent, crushes it in its folds, and finally causes it to disappear in its capacious interior. In this way, many centuries ago, Hinduism on its own ground disposed of Buddhism, which was largely a Hindu reformation; in this way, in a prehistoric period, it absorbed the religion of the Scythian invaders of Northern India; in this way it has converted uneducated Islam in India into a semi-paganism; and in this way it is disposing of the reformed and once hopeful religion of Baba Nanak. Hinduism has embraced Sikhism in its folds; the still comparatively young religion is making a vigorous struggle for life, but its ultimate destruction is, it is apprehended, inevitable without State support.'

But would it not be better to lose the loyalty of the Sikhs than to perpetuate their religion? Mr. Macauliffe does not think so. And accordingly he has given the English reader the first complete and competent account of the Sikh religion.

Until 1893, Mr. Max Arthur Macauliffe was engaged in judicial duties in India. In that year he was requested by certain Sikh societies, which were aware of his appreciation of their literature, to resign his appointment and devote himself to a translation of their sacred books. He did so. In course of time he translated the whole; and, as he translated, he submitted each portion to the criticism of certain learned Sikhs. Thus the work appears as the universally accepted and authorized English translation. And this is well. For there is probably not an Englishman living—even Dr. G. A. Grierson would refuse to be called an exception—capable of criticising it. The work

is in six volumes, published under the title of *The Sikh Religion*, at the Clarendon Press in Oxford (63s. net).

About thirty miles south-west of the city of Lahore, the capital of the Panjab, and on the borders of the present civil districts of Gujranwala and Montgomery, stands the town of Talwandi, deep in a lonely forest. It is on the margin of the Bar or raised forest tract which occupies the centre of the Panjab. The town is still girdled by a broad expanse of arborescent vegetation, which, when not whitened by the sand blown by the winds of the desert, wears through all seasons a cheerful appearance. The jal (*Salvadora Persica*) predominates, but there are also found the phulahi (*Acacia modesta*) and the jand (*Prosopis spicigera*). The wild deer is seen occasionally, startled at the traveller who disturbs the solitude of its domain, and the hare and the partridge cower cautiously among the thickets, deprecating molestation.

In this retreat was born Guru Nanak, the founder of the Sikh religion. His birth took place on the third day of the light half of the month of Baisakh (April–May) in the year 1526 of the Vikramaditya era, corresponding to 1469 A.D. The town has now lost its old name, and is known as Nankana, in memory of the religious teacher to whom it had the honour of giving birth. When the Sikh religion had gained prominence, there was a temple erected on the spot where the Guru was born. It was afterwards rebuilt and enlarged by Raja Tej Singh, at the time when the Sikh arms had attained their greatest power and the Sikh commonwealth its greatest expansion. Within the temple is installed the Granth Sahib, or sacred volume of the Sikh faith, intoned by a professional reader. The innermost shrine contains some cheap printed pictures of the great Guru, and musicians beguile the day chanting the religious metrical compositions of the Gurus.

The great Pandits and Brahmans of Hinduism communicated their instructions in Sanskrit, which they deemed the language of the gods. Guru Nanak and his successors thought it would be of more general advantage to present their messages in the dialects of their age. When Guru Amar Das was asked the reason for this, he replied, 'Well-water can only irrigate adjacent land, but rain-water the whole world. On this account the Guru hath composed his hymns in the language of the people, and enshrined them in the Gurumukhi characters, so that men and women of all castes and classes may read and understand them.'

The Sikhs form a considerable section of the population of the Panjab, and are scattered in greater or less numbers not only throughout the whole of India, but Kabul, Kandahar, China, and Southern Asia. There are two great divisions of Sikhs, Sahijdharis and Singhs. The latter are they who accept the baptism inaugurated by Guru Gobind Singh. All the other Sikhs are called Sahijdharis. The Singhs, after the time of Guru Gobind Singh, were all warriors, the Sahijdharis those who lived at ease, as the word denotes, and practised trade or agriculture.

What, then, is the religion of the Sikhs? Its cardinal principle is the unity of God. On this Guru Nanak took his stand against the abounding idolatry around him. And the unity of God is emphasized and repeated throughout all the Sikh writings. But the personality of God is not so clearly stated. Mr. Macauliffe acknowledges that there are passages in which pantheism is distinctly implied. The difficulty was to avoid anthropomorphism and not fall into pantheism. The other great principle is *nirvana*, or 'absorption in God.' 'Nirvan,' says Mr. Macauliffe, 'from *nir*, "out," and *va*, "to blow," means in Sikh literature the cessation of individual consciousness caused by the blending of the light of the soul with the light of God.' The Sikhs compare it to water blending with water:

> As water blends with water, when
> Two streams their waves unite,
> The light of human life doth blend
> With God's celestial light.
> No transmigrations then await
> The weary human soul;
> It hath attained its resting-place,
> Its peaceful crowning goal.

The moral worth of the Sikh religion in a land like India can, in Mr. Macauliffe's judgment, scarcely be overestimated. 'It prohibits idolatry, hypocrisy, caste exclusiveness, the concremation of widows, the immurement of women, the use of wine and other intoxicants, tobacco-smoking, infanticide, slander, pilgrimages to the sacred rivers and tanks of the Hindus; and it inculcates loyalty, gratitude for all favours received,

philanthropy, justice, impartiality, truth, honesty, and all the moral and domestic virtues known to the holiest citizens of any country.'

But what is all this to us? Let us conclude with a last quotation from Mr. Macauliffe's engaging introduction: 'Those who, secure in their own wisdom and infallibility, and dwelling apart from the Indian people, spurn all knowledge of their theological systems, and thus deem Sikhism a heathen religion, and the spiritual happiness and loyalty of its followers negligible items, are men whose triumph shall be short-lived, and whose glory shall not descend with the accompaniment of minstrel raptures to future generations.'

THE ATONEMENT.

At the University of Chicago Press there has been published a volume of essays on the Atonement. Its title is *Biblical Ideas of Atonement* ($1 net). For it is not a contribution to Systematic Theology. It is an investigation, according to the historical method, of the ideas expressed in the books of the Bible regarding atonement for sin, and reconciliation with God. The investigation is made as little theological as possible, in order that it may be as historical as possible. But lest theological students should be disappointed with the book, two chapters are added at the end of it on 'The Significance of the Biblical Teachings concerning Atonement' and on 'Atonement in the Light of Modern Thought.' The subject is distributed among three members of the Staff of the University. Professor J. M. P. Smith takes the Old Testament, Professor E. De Witt Burton the Non-Canonical Jewish Literature and the New Testament. The last two chapters already referred to are contributed by Professor G. B. Smith.

What are the conclusions? In the Old Testament there is no uniform persistent doctrine of Atonement. Each new age brought with it new ideas concerning God and sin. And change in these conceptions necessitated corresponding change in the formulation of the idea of atonement. The prevailing idea in the earliest times was that of sacrifice or offering as a compensation to Jehovah for an offence against His majesty and holiness. Closely allied to this view was another which saw in the animal sacrificed a substitute for the man whose guilt was deserving of death. These views of sacrifice, say the writers, gradually faded out of Israel's consciousness. After the earliest times there is no substitutionary doctrine of Atonement in the Old Testament.

Nor is there any substitutionary doctrine of Atonement in the New Testament. 'The New Testament writers find the significance of Christ's death in its revelation of God's love, in its realization of the ideal of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah, in its fulfilment of the principle of devotion to the interests of mankind, in accordance with which all men ought to live.'

Whether these results are agreeable or disagreeable, they seem to be honestly arrived at. The last chapter is an effort to show how the gospel may continue to be preached without any doctrine of Atonement.

Where the Chicago Professors stop, the Rev. W. L. Walker begins. His volume, which he entitles *The Gospel of Reconciliation* (T. & T. Clark; 5s.), is theological. It is not the history of the idea of atonement that Mr. Walker is interested in; it is its reality and its value. He searches the Bible certainly. He searches it historically. But at every step he stops to consider the significance of what he has gained, and the progress he is making.

And yet the conclusion to which he comes, though richer in content and of more immediate spiritual advantage, does not greatly differ from the conclusion reached by the professors of the University of Chicago. Confining himself to the meaning of the death of Christ, Mr. Walker does not find that it was, in the ordinary meaning of the word, an atonement. What then was it? He sets down its value in two conclusions. First, Christ's whole life was the expression of the holy and loving Spirit of God, the proof of His goodwill toward men and of His gracious purpose for them. Next, Christ's acceptance of the cross for our sakes was the crowning proof of the Divine love that moved in Him towards mankind.

It is therefore an error, says Mr. Walker, to suppose that Divine forgiveness is *grounded* on the cross. God does not forgive because of the cross: the cross came to Christ because God was forgiving men. What the cross of Christ does for us is to restore us to the consciousness of the forgiving love of God, whereby new saving influences are set a-working within the soul.

How entirely all this is out of touch with the old orthodox doctrine of the Atonement may be seen by turning to a small volume by the Rev. J. B. Oldroyd, M.A., Vicar of Brantingham, which contains an account of *The Doctrine of the Atonement chiefly as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net).

If Mr. Walker and the Chicago professors rightly represent the teaching of the Bible on atonement, then the modern Jewish doctrine is in the direct line of succession. According to the modern Jewish doctrine there is no atonement. An authoritative and absolutely unmistakable declaration of this occurs in a volume of Jewish sermons and addresses recently published.

The author of the volume is Hermann Gollancz, M.A., D.Lit., Rabbi, Preacher to the Bayswater Synagogue, London, and Goldsmid Professor of Hebrew in the University College of the University of London. It is a volume of extraordinary interest to Gentiles. It is so evidently, inevitably, absorbingly Jewish. When the sermons were preached, or the addresses delivered, it is evident that there was not a Gentile within hearing; it has not once been considered that the book will ever fall into a Gentile's hands. So we have the Jewish atmosphere without any mixture of elements. And it is just such a book as this that enables us to understand where the Jew is now, and where in the future he hopes to be. Its title is simply *Sermons and Addresses* (Unwin Brothers; 10s. 6d. net).

There is much Biblical matter in it. For it is a large book of 664 pages, royal octavo. There are short expositions of the Hardening of the Heart, of Jephthah's Vow, of the Dietary Laws, of the Rainbow, of the Sabbath, the Tabernacle, and the Cherubim. There is much light thrown on the Jewish aspect of modern questions in ethics, and even in politics. There are addresses on preaching, on revivals, and on the interchange of pulpits. And there is never any doubt about the attitude of modern Jews, or at least of this very capable and scholarly modern Jew, on any of the matters considered. But we shall be satisfied at present with a glance at what is said about the Atonement.

There is no atonement. Dr. Gollancz goes back, as we recently saw Rabbi Adler go back, to the offer of Moses in the wilderness to become an atonement for the people of Israel. That Moses did offer to become an atonement, Dr. Gollancz has no doubt. For, first, he said to the people, 'Ye have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin.' And, next, he said to God, 'Oh, this people has sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold: yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin,—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.' But he is just as sure that God rejected the atonement. And in the rejection of it, Dr. Gollancz sees a repudiation on God's part of the idea of atonement for ever. Accordingly he says: 'The idea of vicarious atonement, that one man shall bear sin and die for another, or for a whole people, or for a whole world, is, according to the teaching of Judaism, displeasing to Heaven, and directly opposed to the idea of God's justice and mercy.'

But there is another book. Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has published a volume on *The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation* (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net). Mediation is not atonement, and Dr. Oesterley does not confound them. But it is so closely allied to atonement that the book may be taken here. And all the more that the author deals directly with the Jewish doctrine of atonement as defined by Dr. Adler and Dr. Gollancz.

Dr. Oesterley goes back with them to the atonement offered by Moses in the wilderness. He says the point is not whether the Lord accepted the offer. The point is that the offer was made. And by whom? 'By Israel's greatest teacher; by the man to whom God revealed the Torah; by the man who, with perhaps the exception of Abraham, is more venerated by Hebrews than any other who has ever lived.' And Dr. Oesterley points out that there is no hint that Moses was wrong in making the offer. Then he recalls the case of Abraham, who made intercession for the city of Sodom, and was answered, 'If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then will I spare all the place for their sake'—which looks very like the germ of a doctrine of Atonement.

But, as we have said, Dr. Oesterley's book is not directly on the doctrine of the Atonement. It is a very capable and thorough exposition of the Jewish doctrine of Mediation.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION.

There is no study so popular as the study of Religion. And that is chiefly because a new method for the study has been found. It is the psychological method. Psychology is itself, in any systematic form, a new study. It has made so much progress of late that it is now willingly granted the position of a science. And it had scarcely obtained this recognition when it was used to elucidate the facts and explain the phenomena of religion, with results at once surprising and gratifying.

The Rev. George Galloway, M.A., B.D., D.Phil., hitherto known as an accomplished and acute metaphysician, has written a volume on *The Principles of Religious Development* (Macmillan; 10s. net). He has not written or attempted to write a History of the Development of Religion. He has given his attention to the principles which underlie and are disclosed in the development of religion. For he is in lively sympathy with that psychological method which, as we have said, is the present most popular way of studying religion. His purpose, accordingly, is, in a word, to bring the science of psychology to bear on the evidences of religious life in the past and the present, in order to discover the principles by which religion has passed from that state in which it is scarce distinguishable from magic to the faith that is in Christ Jesus.

Now, in the first place, Dr. Galloway is clear that religion is not an accidental or external thing, but that it has 'its roots in human nature.' He is also clear that it did not arise at the beginning from the exercise of a single faculty in man. That was Hume's mistake, repeating the notion of Epicurus and Lucretius, as he traced the religious attitude to the emotion of fear. That was Kant's mistake, as he went to the other side from Hume, eliminated the element of feeling altogether, and connected religion ultimately with the will. That, finally, is the mistake of minor men since Kant, who have declared that man was a religious being simply because he could think.

Dr. Galloway, we say, is a psychologist. The psychologist takes account of all that is left to man after the physiologist has had his share. Religion is due partly to feeling, partly to thinking, partly to willing. And not to each of these separately or in turn, but to the operation of all these together—in short, to the play of man's psychology. Its origin is due to psychology, though Dr. Galloway says little about its origin, simply because he knows little: especially is its development due to psychology. And so the volume is an exposition, full, patient, powerful, of the place which feeling, thinking, and willing have had in the development of religion, and of the action and interaction of the one upon the other.

A FEW BOOKS OF DEVOTION.

Begin with the late Principal Marcus Dods. It is a posthumous volume, and there is neither editor nor introduction. There are short meditations on selected topics, with a short prayer at the end of each meditation. The note is sincerity. The thought is robust, and the language appropriate. But both in prayer and in meditation the note is absolute sincerity. The title is *Footsteps in the Path of Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

From Dr. Dods it is proper to pass to Professor Macewen, his colleague in the New College, Professor Macewen has made a study of *Antoinette Bourignon, Quietist* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It is the day for it. Antoinette Bourignon will get a hearing to-day such as she has not obtained for a century. And Professor Macewen is the man for it—a scholar who is not afraid to take down folios; a Presbyterian who has added the Imitatio to the Shorter Catechism. He is not a Bourignian. He does for us just what we sent him to do—gathers out all that is good in Bourignianism for this present time, and throws the bad away. Also he shows us that Antoinette Bourignon was better than her Bourignianism.

Before going further, let us recommend a book under whose shadow we have sat down with great delight. The author is Dora Farncomb, of 52 Victor Avenue, Toronto, and the title *The Vision of his Face* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). It catches the attention first by the exceeding appropriateness of its quotations. It holds it by its own exceeding spirituality.

Mr. Elliot Stock is also the publisher of *The Christ in Holy Communion*, by the Rev. T. A. Gurney, M.A., LL.B. (1s. net).

Messrs. Longmans have published a new and attractive edition of Archbishop Leighton's *Rules and Instructions for a Holy Life* (2s. net). The editor is the Rev. James Dinwoodie.

Another reprint is Myers' *Saint Paul*, one of Mr. Allenson's 'Heart and Life Booklets' (1s. net). Mr. Allenson has also issued in the same series *A Psalter for Daily Use*, arranged by Professor Knight (1s. net).

A new book by Dr. Andrew Murray is always an event to the lover of devotional literature. It consists of some studies on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Its title is simply *Aids to Devotion* (Nisbet; 1s.).

Here take in a little volume of poems called *Puritan Pansies* (Headley Brothers). The author is Mr. Claud Field.

The Rev. P. Hately Waddell, D.D., has written a large volume of *Thoughts on Modern Mysticism* (Blackwood; 3s. 6d.). The word 'Thoughts' in the title is more modest than it need be. It is really a systematic description of the philosophical origin and implications of Mysticism. The last chapter but one touches the mysticism in Christian Science.

Last of all comes a book by Dr. James Drummond, entitled *Johannine Thoughts* (Green; 3s. 6d. net). It is partly prose and partly poetry. It is all original, thoughtful, devotional. There are friends of Dr. Drummond who are unwise enough to express 'a poor opinion' of the Fourth Gospel. This shows what it can be to the spiritual life of a man born and brought up to distrust its history and its theology.

The Rev. J. O. Bevan.

We had one volume from Mr. Bevan last month. This month we have other two. The first to be noticed is an *Exposition of the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the Book of Common Prayer* (George Allen & Sons; 3s. 6d. net). The exposition consists of remarks more in observation than in exposition, with an occasional anecdote. On the words 'they enclosed a great multitude of fishes,' Mr. Bevan says: 'We cannot tell, and it is idle to inquire, whether Omnipotence or Omniscience was most concerned in this miracle, but we cannot fail to recognize the power of Christ as Creator and Sustainer.' The words 'there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth,' he illustrates with this anecdote: 'A distinguished evangelist relates that one afternoon he noticed at the service a young lady whom he knew to be a teacher. At the conclusion of the service, he asked her where her class was. 'Oh,' said she, 'I went to the school, and found only a little boy—so I came away.' '*Only* a little boy?' said the clergyman; 'think of the value of one such soul! The fires of a Reformation may be slumbering in that tow-headed lad! There may be a Wesley, a Whitefield, a Xavier in your class. Never despise the units. Think of souls individually, even as God thinks of them. Christ came down not only to die for the *world*—to die for *all*—but to die for all *one by one*; and if there had been but one sinner to be saved, for that sinner would He gladly have died, and gladly have suffered the tortures that He actually endured to save all mankind!'

The other volume is entitled *Egypt and the Egyptians* (George Allen & Sons; 5s. net). It is a sketch of the History, Antiquities, Language, and Religion of the Ancient Egyptians, and their influence over Palestine. Mr. Bevan is not himself either an explorer or a decipherer. But he knows what both the explorer and the decipherer have been doing, and he gives a reliable compact account of their results, down to the very latest spadeful or squeeze.

Benedict Spinoza.

The best introduction to philosophy is the introduction to a philosopher. Professor A. Wolf, M.A., D.Lit., of the University of London, introduces us to Spinoza. And his very purpose is to introduce us to the philosophy of Spinoza, and from that to the love of philosophy itself. He has taken the best plan possible. He has translated *Spinoza's Short Treatise on God, Man, and his Well-Being* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). He has written an introduction to the Short Treatise, and a commentary on it. He has given a list of the necessary literature. He has prefaced the whole with a life of Spinoza. And he has lightened our labour, if not his own, by the introduction of twelve excellent photographs. The whole is the work of a well-trained mind, whose training has been obtained largely from the long study he has given to this very philosopher. It is an admirable example of the benefit of specializing.

The Baptist Historical Society.

The fourth number of the first volume of the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* (Baptist Union; 2s. net) contains an essay by

Dr. W. T. Whitley, on 'Benjamin Stinton and his Baptist Friends, and a Record of his Historical Researches.' The rest of the number contains memorials of the Jacob-Lathorp-Jessey Church, 1616–1641.

The second volume of the *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England* has now been issued. It is edited for the Baptist Historical Society by the Rev. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., and published at the Kingsgate Press. The minutes are usually brief; sometimes not much more than a record of the sederunt. But when matters are entered upon, they are matters of almost universal interest, they are such matters as occupied the attention of the earliest Christians of all. One question is whether a Baptist should marry outside the Baptist Communion. On this subject one of the ministers sent a letter to the General Assembly of 1744, in which he said, 'The severity contended for, especially as to some persons, is a very great hardship. Marriage has its rise and expedients from our nature and constitution. 'Tis Honourable in all: 'Tis better to marry than to be in pain. Now, since among us in this nation the women are not permitted to Look out for themselves; and when they have no offers from among the men of their own Community, what must they do?'

Paradise Lost.

Mr. A. W. Verity and Milton 'belong together,' as they say over the water. Mr. Verity has now gathered his volumes on the separate books of the *Paradise Lost* into one volume, all the notes into one appendix of notes, and all the glossaries into one alphabetical glossary. And now this bulky book is the only edition of the poem worth looking at until one has reached the age for Masson. It is published at the Cambridge University Press (7s. 6d. net).

Apostolic Christianity.

Was the Church of England justified in separating from the Church of Rome? Mr. A. W. F. Blunt says it was. And it is justified in remaining separate, because the Church of Rome has not reformed itself. Were the Baptist, the Congregational, and the Methodist Churches justified in separating from the Church of England? Mr. Blunt says they were. But he says they are not justified in remaining separate, because the Church of England has reformed itself.

The Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, M.A., Vicar of Carrington, sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Exeter College, Oxford, has published a small volume of *Studies in Apostolic Christianity* (Dent; 2s. 6d. net). The studies are historical, but the author is unable to avoid touching upon living and even controversial issues. His spirit, however, is as acceptable as his scholarship is unassailable. And even when he discusses the question of reunion, he avoids offence as much as it is in the power of any man to avoid it who belongs to one branch of the Church and wholeheartedly believes in that branch.

The Catholic Who's Who.

The *Catholic Who's Who and Year-Book* is edited by Sir F. C. Burnand (Burns and Oates; 3s. 6d. net). Now the first duty of the editor of a year-book is to include everything that should be included in it while keeping it within bounds. And Sir F. C. Burnand knows that that is the first duty. This is what he says about it: 'In successful Annuals, as in successful men, the tendency in growing years is to become unwieldy in bulk. The publishers have therefore dieted the 1910 issue of the *Catholic Who's Who* by a complete re-setting and re-arrangement of its pages, and by the use of an increased number of abbreviations; the addition of 1200 new biographies leaves the book therefore with the admired slimness of its first issue.' That does not mean that 1200 new biographies have been added this year, it means 1200 since the first issue. But 500 have been added this year, which makes us wonder what the editor will have to do ten years hence, if his constituency increases at the same pace. A Catholic Who's Who must be more useful, we think, to Protestants than to Catholics. But the use of this Who's Who would be greatly increased if the address were added at the end of each biography.

Aristotle.

We hope that the student of Philosophy is aware of the steady issue in English of the works of Aristotle. The newest issue is a translation of the *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, made by Mr. L. D. Dowdall, B.D., LL.B. (Clarendon Press; 2s. net).

Mount Athos.

The monasteries of Mount Athos are much resorted to for the study of Biblical and Patristic manuscripts. Professor Kirsopp Lake of Leiden is one who has often visited them. And he has not allowed himself to be entirely absorbed in the manuscripts. He has studied the early history of monasticism on the Holy Mountain. *The Early Days of Monasticism on Mount Athos* is the fruit of this study (Clarendon Press; 8s. 6d. net). It is a small volume for so large a price. But there are books that are priceless, and this is one of them. For its information is worth having, and it is not to be had anywhere else. It contains four chapters, and to each chapter there is an appendix of documents.

There are three periods through which Greek monasticism has passed—the hermit period, the period of loose organization of hermits in lauras, and the period in which the laura is replaced by the monastery, with definite buildings and fixed regulations. Professor Lake's volume collects the evidence for the existence, even on Mount Athos, of the hermit and laura periods.

Sin.

The Rev. W. E. Orchard sent an essay on *Modern Theories of Sin* to the London University examiners for the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and obtained the degree. The essay is an astonishment. Is there any other man who has read so much about sin as Dr. Orchard has read? And is it not a sign of the time that the mere discussion of what sin is should fill so large a book?

Dr. Orchard divides his discussion into three parts and thirteen chapters. The parts are introductory, critical, and constructive. The most enticing chapters are those of the second part, which treat of (1) theories which trace sin to the will of man (Kant, Coleridge, Julius Müller); (2) theories which regard sin as a necessity (Schelling, Weisse, Hegel); (3) theories which seek to explain sin by confining it within the bounds of religion (Schleiermacher, Ritschl); and (4) theories which seek to explain sin from empirical observation (Pfleiderer, Tennant).

Then comes the long quest for a satisfactory working modern theory of sin. And perhaps this may be given as what it arrives at: the conscience, illumined by the revelation of Christ, declares that any condition which falls short of His standard for the individual or the community is one that ought to be repudiated and cast off.

The book is published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co.

The Finsbury Library.

Mr. Culley has issued other six volumes of the cheap series of reprints, edited by the Rev. John Telford, B.A., and called 'The Finsbury Library.' Three of the volumes contain a translation of Dante's *Commedia*, a translation not altogether unknown to Dante students, but rarely possessed by them. It is, of course, the work of a Wesleyan Methodist, the Rev. John Wesley Thomas. The preface to the first volume was dated 'Penrith, April 1859.' Cobbett's *Rural Rides* fill other two volumes, and the sixth is *The Early Journal of Charles Wesley* (1s. net each).

Philosophy and Religion.

Dr. Hastings Rashdall has sent for Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology,' the MS. of six lectures delivered at Cambridge on *Philosophy and Religion* (2s. 6d. net). The lecture that has given us most food for thought is the fifth. Its subject is Revelation. What is revelation? As Dr. Rashdall understands it, revelation is discovery. It is made on earth. But it is not made simply by hard thinking. The man who is to obtain any revelation must first of all have an interest in religion. 'If I take no interest in the properties of curves or the square root of -1, I am not very likely to make a good mathematician. This connection of knowledge with interest applies in an exceptional degree to religious knowledge.' This leads Dr. Rashdall into a definition of faith, and this is the definition: 'Religious faith means the deliberate adoption by an effort of the will, as practically certain for purposes of action and of feeling, of a religious belief which to the intellect is, or may be, merely probable.'

Crete.

Keep your eye on Crete. The study of studies is Religion. The great revolution in the study of Religion is mightily encouraged by the discoveries in Crete. And Crete is good for the shaking up of the historian also. Minos? The Labyrinth? Ariadne? Yes, says the discoverer, they are all here, found to be historical and ready to revolutionize the study of history. And so, this volume on *Crete, the Forerunner of Greece* (2s. 6d. net), which has been written most capably and most

pleasantly by Charles Henry Hawes, M.A., and Harriet Boyd Hawes, M.A., and added to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought,' will be found as full of wonder as it is of wisdom.

The Person and Place of Jesus Christ.

It is not easy to read this large book. After the first hundred pages it has to be laid aside for a time. Yet it must be read to the end.

There is no absence of interest. The difficulty is in the packing of thought. Dr. P. T. Forsyth is mentally most alert, and expects no less mental alertness in his readers. Every sentence has to be read. And every sentence is worth reading.

It is the Congregational Union Lecture for 1909. And it is not less notable as a contribution to the doctrine of the Person of Christ than was the Congregational Union Lecture of Dr. Dale to the doctrine of the Atonement. Perhaps a quoted sentence or two will be the best review.

Take this: 'What, it has been asked in many tones of late, what is the essence of Christianity? The best known answer, that of Harnack, is too meagre. He is too much of a devout historian, and too little of a spiritual thinker. The essence of Christianity is Jesus Christ, the historic Redeemer and Lord and God, dwelling in his Church's faith. I have already said that there never was a time, even in the Church's earliest days, when Christianity was but the reproduction of the personal faith of Jesus, or the effort to live His ethic. It was always a faith in Jesus concentric with the Church's faith in God.'

Again, take this: 'It cannot be too often recalled that the article of Christ's deity is the theological expression of the evangelical experience of his salvation, apart from which it is little less than absurd, and no wonder it is incredible.'

And again this: 'If God produces a special understanding of the fact, He must have produced the fact. If apostles so moved saw in the resurrection of Christ such significance, then the fact itself is not at the mercy of mere historical evidence. The act of faith when it rises to inspiration gives us the reality of its object in giving us its power. If God made men so to read and trust the resurrection power, He could not be misleading them as to the creative fact it streamed from. The same spirit effected both. If inspited knowledge grew out of a certain fact, that fact is a part of God's revelation. We cannot take the resurrection gospel and leave the resurrection fact.'

The criticism to be made is solely that the book takes so much hard reading. There may seem lack of system, but that discovers itself. Not only so, but it is found that the sentences which seem to be going round and round are really moving forward. It might have been easier for the reader if the order which runs through the book had been more manifest on the surface. But the obliteration of landmarks was no doubt part of Dr. Forsyth's plan, to make us read the book and keep us from picking and choosing among its topics. And, in any case, it is not a theological exposition of the doctrine of Christ's Person that is offered. The title is *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (Thomas Law; 10s. 6d.). Not the person only, but also the place. And it is the author's chief desire that Christ should be made to occupy that place in our lives which is His because of the fact and significance of His Person.

Old Testament History and Literature.

A manual of Old Testament History recording the results of recent criticism, both historical and literary, has been written by the Rev. B. H. Alford, late Vicar of St. Luke's, Nutford Place, London, and published by Messrs. Longmans (5s. net). Many such manuals have been issued recently, but now the interest is so widespread, the results so assured, and the spiritual and ethical gains so enormous, that many manuals are likely to be issued, and there is room for them all. It is impossible to say whether Mr. Alford means his book to be used in the class-room or read in the home. It is certainly very pleasant to read. We believe it will be just as good to teach.

Dr. Maclaren's Expositions.

This great enterprise in the publication of sermons—beaten by Spurgeon's and by none other—is nearing the end. The new volume contains *Philippians*, *Colossians*, *Thessalonians*, *and* 1 *Timothy* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.).

Broken Earthenware.

How many of our purely professional men of letters take an interest in the doings of the Salvation Army? Mr. Harold Begbie is one, but we cannot think of another. There is therefore the pleasure of surprise, as well as the joy of thankful-

ness, in the reading of these sketches of typical cases of conversion made by the officers of the Army. The title is *Broken Earthenware* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.)—an artist's title. And Mr. Begbie has found plenty of artistic material in this unpromising field. But art is not everything, and occasionally Mr. Begbie is quite carried away. It is meet that he should make merry and be glad.

Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities.

Several of Macaulay's essays have been published separately for use in schools. But we have not seen the essay on Civil Disabilities of the Jews. It has been separately published now, together with the speech which Macaulay delivered in the House of Commons on April 17, 1833. And both speech and essay have been annotated and edited by Mr. Israel Abrahams, M.A., and the Rev. S. Levy, M.A. For the combined study of English and of Ethics, where will a better instrument be found than this volume? The title is *Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities* (Jewish Historical Society).

The Bible for Home and School.

The new volumes of the 'Bible for Home and School,' edited by Professor Shailer Mathews of Chicago, are (1) *Genesis*, and (2) *Colossians and Ephesians* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. each). The editor of *Genesis* is Professor H. G. Mitchell, who is thoroughly acquainted with the issues involved; and as Genesis has not yet appeared in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges,' this commentary should be particularly welcome. One valuable feature is the list of various readings given on every page, from the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and Targums. Where else can we find these readings conveniently?

The *Colossians and Ephesians* volume is the work of Professor Gross Alexander. It is slightly more conservative than the average volume of this series will be. And that is no fault. For the book is quite up to date in scholarship, and whatever is affirmed as fact may be relied on as capable of affirmation. The notes are clear, incisive, and memorable. But they are not always to be received with thanksgiving. Professor Alexander must reconsider his judgment on the law that was 'taken out of the way.' He says it was only the ceremonial law. So we are in bondage still.

Darwinism and Human Life.

Professor J. Arthur Thomson of Aberdeen delivered the South African Lectures in 1909. And as the South African Lectures are delivered at the invitation of the South African Association for the advancement of Science, he inevitably chose Darwinism for his subject. He has now published the lectures under the title of *Darwinism and Human Life* (Melrose; 5s. net).

Professor Arthur Thomson is one of the very few who can make science popular. And he deliberately sets himself to do it. He can make science popular enough even for the preacher. The preacher will find illustrations in his books, reliable and illuminating—the best kind of illustrations. But besides being profitable for the pulpit, the new book, like all Professor Thomson's books, is very good entertainment. Here is a paragraph by the way.

'To keep a famous inland fish-pond from giving out, some boxes of mud and manure were placed at the sides. Bacteria—the minions of all putrefaction—worked in the mud and manure, making food for minute Infusorians, which multiply so rapidly that there may be a million from one in a week's time. A cataract of Infusorians overflowed from box to pond, and the water-fleas and other small fry gathered at the foot of the fall and multiplied exceedingly. Thus the fishes were fed, and, as fish-flesh is said to be good for the brain, we can trace a nexus from mud to clear thinking. What was in the mud became part of the Infusorian, which became part of the Crustacean, which became part of the fish, which became part of the man. And it is thus that the world goes round.'

English Church History.

Mr. Burn has been fortunate in getting Dr. Alfred Plummer to undertake a volume of his 'Handbooks of English Church History.' The volume is now issued under the title of *The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net). There are few Church historians of our day who carry more weight than Dr. Plummer, he is so free from bias and so faithful to fact. Having the gift of imagination, he has it under discipline.

Dr. Paul Carus.

Dr. Paul Carus is a very advanced critic of Christianity, but he has no desire to destroy it. He criticises it severely because he loves it dearly.

He would separate the kernel of it from the husk. In his latest book he has gone back to the beginning, and under the title of *The Pleroma* (Open Court Publishing Co.; $1) has written an essay on the origin of Christianity. The great factor in the rise of Christianity was the faculty of idealization, which the early Christians seem to have possessed in a degree entitling them to the wonder of all the world. The explanation, in fact, simply substitutes one miracle for another. If Jesus was not the miracle which the Gospels declare, it is a greater miracle that the Gospels are able to declare it.

Dr. Carus has issued a synopsis of all his writings under the title of *Philosophy as a Science* (50 cents). The book gets its title from an essay which introduces it. We must not use the words miracle and miraculous lightly. But how shall we express our wonder when we find it takes a book of 200 pages to record little more than the titles of the books and articles which Dr. Carus has written in his lifetime—books and articles of scientific value and on the most difficult of scientific subjects? The volume is introduced by an essay on Philosophy as a Science.

The Nicene Creed.

A short and altogether reliable history and exposition of *The Nicene Creed* is sure to find favour, and Dr. A. E. Burn was the man prepared for it. The little volume belongs to the Oxford Church Text-Books (Rivingtons; 1s. net).

The Hebrew Genius.

Mr. Leon Simon has edited a volume of essays on Jewish literature and thought, calling it *Aspects of the Hebrew Genius* (Routledge; 2s. 6d.). There are seven essays. Their subjects are Philo, Saadiah, Maimonides, Jewish Codes and Codifiers, Aristotle and Mediæval Jewish Thought, Jewish Mysticism, and the Jewish New Learning of the Nineteenth Century. There is also an introduction by Mr. E. N. Adler, in which we are told that the volume covers the whole range of Jewish thought during Christian times; that the essays are independent and may be read in any order, but they had better be read in their order in the book.

Well, what is the Hebrew genius? It is the genius for religion. There are other things that the Jews have done well; this is the only thing that they have done supremely well. Everything else, indeed, obtains its value from the measure of the religion it holds.

Against the Real Presence.

It is the doctrine of the Real Presence that divides Christians. And there is no other division worth naming beside this division. The Rev. P. C. Ingrouille, B.D., has studied the doctrine of the Real Presence, and he has written its history and its condemnation in a volume entitled *Our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving* (Thynne; 3s. net). Mr. Ingrouille understands the issue and is in earnest. But he takes his side as a Christian, not as a politician. He has confidence that the truth itself will find its way to the reader's mind, the two being made to embrace one another. On the whole we do not know a clearer or more convincing statement of the historical argument on the evangelical side.

Comparative Religion.

Mr. L. H. Jordan is ever on the watch to further the cause of Comparative Religion—no man more strenuously. He has issued a survey of the literature for the years 1906 to 1909. It is his second survey of the kind. It may be had from Messrs. Otto Schulze of Edinburgh.

Public Opinion.

End with a periodical this month, and let the periodical be *Public Opinion*. Yet no description can cover its manifold variety or suggest its invariable excellence. It keeps one in touch with science, politics, and literature: it almost makes newspapers and books indispensable.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, M.A., D.D., Edinburgh.

Ignorance.

It is a clever literary stroke which at this point relieves a long conversation—always difficult to sustain with unflagging interest—by an incident. In this second interview with Ignorance, Bunyan unquestionably has in his mind that chapter from the *Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* entitled 'The Sin and Danger of Ignorance.' As a sample of that exceedingly lively chapter the following page may be quoted:—

Theologus. Who was Christ's mother?

Asunetus. Mary, sir; that was our blessed lady.

Theol. Who was Pontius Pilate?

Asun. I am somewhat ignorant, I am not book-learned; but if you will have my simple opinion, I think it was the devil; for none but the devil would put our sweet Saviour to death.

Theol. What is the holy catholic church, which you say you do believe?

Asun. The communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins.

Theol. What do you pray for when you say 'Thy Kingdom come'?

Asun. I do pray that God would send us all of His grace, that we may serve Him and do as we ought to do, and keep us in a good mind to God-ward, and to have Him much in our minds; for some, God bless us, have nothing but the devil in their mind; they do nothing in God's name.

Theol. What is a sacrament?

Asun. The Lord's Supper.

Theol. How many sacraments be there?

Asun. Two.

Theol. Which be they?

Asun. Bread and wine.

Theol. What is the principal end of your coming to receive the sacrament?

Asun. To receive my Maker.

Theol. What is the principal use of a sacrament?

Asun. The body and blood of Christ.

Theol. What profit and comfort have you by a sacrament?

Asun. In token that Christ died for us.

Theol. I can but pity you for your ignorance; for it is exceeding gross and palpable. Your answers are to no purpose, and bewray a wonderful blindness and senselessness in matters of religion, etc.

It is true that Asunetus differs from Ignorance in his ingeniousness, and yet they have much in common. Neither is ignorant in the sense of general boorishness, for both are in a certain sense well-informed. Yet both are shallow in mental faculty and slender in information. They are well-versed in the language of theology, and have both built out of its current phrases a system satisfactory to themselves. But, like all private systems which are founded upon words rather than upon thoughts and knowledge, there is a continual sense of aloofness from the facts of the case, which is less tolerable in self-made systems than in those at least accredited by historical theology.

Bunyan's Ignorance has been contrasted with the family of Valiant-for-Truth, who lived in Darkland. Valiant's family were ignorant about facts; Ignorance was ignorant about principles. And it is this that accounts for the elaborate and somewhat bitter treatment which Ignorance receives. There is a moral quality in this man's ignorance, which is difficult to define in any one statement; but, nevertheless, perfectly obvious as we consider the case in detail. The subtle influences that combine to make up this character remind us of Coleridge's happy phrase, 'The impudence of ignorance,' and justify Kerr Bain's remark that here we have 'Obstinate at the other end of the pilgrimage.'

1. The fact which is apparent at the outset is that he likes his own company better than that of others. This is a splendid piece of analysis, and it reveals a quite familiar type of character in every generation. There are men whose greatness makes them solitary, and there are men whose littleness makes them solitary; some whose thoughts are too far-reaching and too deep to be shared with others, and some whose thoughts are so little founded on common knowledge that they at once betray their poverty when brought out into the open. Every one has met with half-educated men who are fascinated with a few fine ideas, held apart from their relations with other ideas, and liable to topple over in conversation. Such men prefer anything to the ordinary honest

labour of study, and imagine themselves heaven-born geniuses, because their intellectual sloth has deprived them of all standards for judging the worth and originality of such ideas. Montaigne has said that 'A dog we know is better company than a man whose language we do not understand'; and such men as Ignorance, understanding no man's language but their own, find every man bad company who has any real grasp of truth.

2. A curious consequence of this solitary habit, and a very significant one, is that Ignorance has had no experiences by the way. We hear nothing of encounters either with enemies like Atheist and Flatterer, or with friends like Evangelist and Faithful. With smooth advance he has gone on and on, till here we find him half-way through the enchanted ground without drowsiness. Travelled men who are self-absorbed have wasted both their money and their time in travel. The love of adventure, the companionable spirit, the quick eye for new impressions, are absolutely indispensable if travel is to do its proper work of educating the mind. In such men the lack of perspective and proportion becomes intensified by chronic neglect of that which should have corrected it, and they become incurably provincial in intellect and imagination.

3. The source of all this evil is the complacency of Ignorance's good opinion of himself and of his heart. Bunyan himself knew something about that. There was a time when he had said, 'Now I was become godly; now I was become a right honest man' (*Grace Abounding*). But on after reflexion, Bunyan had seen that all this was but the work of those indiscreet neighbours of his—his first models for the picture of Flatterer—who had begun 'to praise, to commend, and to speak well of me, both to my face and behind my back,' upon one of his early reformations. Ignorance is his own Flatterer. And, little dreaming how deeply he was entangled in the nets, he had seen Christian and Hopeful entangled, and thanked God he was not as they. Thus this man's ignorance is centred in ignorance of himself. Instead of knowing himself, he loves himself and believes in himself. His self-examination is accordingly a sorry business. Robert Browning's well-known line is curiously and ironically relevant:

> Be love your light and trust your guide, with these explore my heart.

But when a man explores his own heart by the lamp of self-love and under the guidance of trust in himself, the result is strange and pitiful. Three notes sum up this examination, viz.:—

(1) *Comfort*, which is mentioned twice on one page, is his main demand in religion. But comfort never was nor can be the first matter in dealing with Jesus Christ. To those who come only for this, He offers 'not peace but a sword.' Comfort there is indeed in Him, but it is the comfort of the Truth, and before that can be reached there are many discomforting questions to be settled.

(2) *Desire*, the well-spring of comfort, and the substitute for character in such souls. There is, indeed, a wonderful virtue in desire. 'Rabbi ben Ezra' assures us that

> What I aspired to be,
> And was not, comforts me;

and in 'Saul' we have the even bolder assurance that

> 'Tis not what man Does which exalts him, but what man Would do.

Our own Larger Catechism, in still plainer language, asserts that 'One who doubteth of his being in Christ . . . may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof; and in God's account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity.' It is easy to see how such views as these may be perverted into the fallacy that 'the desire for grace is grace.' Their truth or falsity depends entirely upon the attitude of the will. Desire, accompanied by strenuous endeavour, counts as attainment whether the endeavour succeed or fail; desire without action is mere sentiment, which may be the worst enemy of character.

(3) *Leaving all*, a phrase which shows that the author had here the rich young ruler in his mind. 'How very hard a thing it is to be a Christian!' But it is not a hard thing to adopt the language of Christianity and to adapt it to one's own moral and emotional conditions. The one outstanding fact about Ignorance is that he has not left all. For Christ's demand is 'Let him deny *himself*,' and Ignorance clings to himself, in an unbounded love and trust. As for other renunciations, such as money, or land, or details of property, or habits that he may have surrendered, they have no value except as parts of the great central renunciation—

the giving up of oneself. It is us, not ours, that Christ asks for and will have.

The Word of God.

Christian, tired of the constant reference to his own heart upon which Ignorance falls back, insists on bringing all disputed matters to the test of the Divine Word. This was the characteristic fashion of Puritan Theology, and to it the Word of God meant simply the Scriptures.

1. *Regarding thoughts*, especially thoughts about ourselves. Here Christian quotes three texts, two from the Book of Genesis and one from the Epistle to the Romans, to show that there are no good thoughts in man's mind at all except the conviction of this his total depravity. It may be said, and truly, that this is not the complete testimony of Scripture, and that many passages might be found which acknowledge natural virtue in man. And, indeed, the 'proof-text' method is always precarious in this respect; that selections of texts isolated from the context may be constructed so as to prove the most astounding paradoxes. In the case before us, there is an inner witness, and, as Martineau has it, an inner 'seat of authority,' which must inevitably be the final court of appeal, and whose authority is necessarily paramount, over that of both Church and written Scripture. When reformation theology forgot that, it fell into the same error as the Catholicism it opposed, substituting one external authority for another, and doing less than justice to the witness of the Spirit. On the other hand, the validity of such inward witness depends entirely upon the state of mind and character in him who claims it. Ignorance, like Kipling's 'Tomlinson,' is one whose thoughts count for nothing because of his inveterate self-satisfaction and his incurable slightness. It is such thinking as his that made the Psalmist break out into his famous epigram, 'I hate thoughts' (Ps 119^{113}). But when a man's spirit is humble and sincere, his desire towards the will of God, and his thoughts therefore deep and worthy, he may trust his judgment, and even when he makes mistakes he need not blame himself too bitterly. The Pope, in *The Ring and the Book*, carries conviction when he says regarding his judgment, that even it should be proved mistaken:

> What other should I say than 'God so willed:
> Mankind is ignorant, a man am I,
> Call ignorance my sorrow, not my sin'?

2. *Regarding ways*, and God's judgment of our ways, the same plan is followed, and a selection of texts made to prove the badness of man's ways apart from grace. This passage owes something to *The Plain Man's Pathway*, and the concluding sentences of it may be compared with this of Theologus, 'If a man could see into their souls as he doth into their bodies, he would stop his nose at the stink of them; for they smell rank of sin in the nostrils of God, His angels, and all good men.'

The language is strong, and the mood severe. But the fact is that to be ignorant is to be dangerous. This light-hearted, feather-headed way of dealing with morals is one of the most dangerous things in the world, both for the man himself and for all with whom he comes in contact. Ignorance does not know what he is talking about when he discourses upon sin and righteousness. He has never been there at all, and the words are but words to him. Sin and righteousness are to him negotiable assets, pawns in the game of life. It is no wonder if those great men the Puritans, whose greatness was founded upon an uncompromising thoroughness in their dealings with moral truth, feeling the awfulness of the danger, were unsparing in their handling of such lightness. The whole passage reminds us of Pascal's saying, that 'There are two kinds of men; the righteous, who believe themselves sinners, and the sinners, who believe themselves righteous.'

The Faith of Ignorance.

'Do you think,' Ignorance answers to Christian's scathing words, 'that I am such a fool as to think that God can see no further than I?' In what follows he goes on to give an account of the central matter, saving faith in Christ, as he conceived it. How many readers of this passage see at the first hasty glance what is wrong or defective in such faith? Does not the rebuking passage seem fantastic and hair-splitting on matters where an elaborate theological system of doctrine is presupposed? Yet on closer scrutiny the crucial error becomes apparent. The man is willing to admit his sinfulness in general but not in particular, in platitude but not in conscience. Similarly he utters a generality about faith—'I must believe in Christ for justification'—but comes to utter confusion in details. This is the deadliest danger of all shallow natures. Generalities are

cheap, delusive, and worthless. The whole business of the soul is done where it comes to personal and detailed considerations. That is the drift of all Christian's questions, to force him from the general to the particular. In no passage has Mr. J. M. Barrie displayed a truer insight into the heart of Scottish religion than when, in his *Tommy and Grizel*, he shows up the sentimentalist by forcing him up against the direct thought of God.

Two notes to this passage may be of interest.

1. Christian's answer, 'How! Think thou must believe in Christ when thou seest not thy need of Him!'—a sentence which leads us again to *The Plain Man's Pathway*:—

Theologus. I see you need no Saviour.

Asun. You say not well in that: I need a Saviour, and it is my Lord Jesus that must save me, for He made me.

Theol. What! need you a Saviour, since you are no sinner?

Asun. Yes, believe me, I am a sinner; we are all sinners; there is no man but he sinneth.

In this quotation, as indeed in the whole extract given at the beginning of this article, we see the same confused dealing with generalities and conventional phrases which is the very mark of Bunyan's Ignorance.

2. It is also interesting to notice that in the end Ignorance falls headlong into Roman Catholic theology. His doctrine of justification is that 'Christ makes my duties, that are religious, acceptable to His Father by virtue of His merits, and so I shall be justified'—a statement in which there is a suggestion not only of the Roman Catholic doctrine of Justification, but of the transference of the merits of saints. Of that doctrine of justification, which is essentially concerned with a man's own good deeds, and not with the free grace of God in Christ, Luther's words on Gal $1^{15.16.17}$ were known to Bunyan, and were doubtless not without their effect on the conversation of Christian here: 'I crucified Christ daily in my monkish life, and blasphemed God through my false faith wherein I then continually lived. Outwardly I was not as other men, extortioners, unjust, whoremongers; but I kept chastity, poverty, and obedience. . . . Notwithstanding in the meantime I fostered under this cloaked holiness and trust in mine own righteousness, continual mistrust, doubtfulness, fear, hatred, and blasphemy against God. And this my righteousness was nothing else but a filthy puddle, and the very kingdom of the devil. For Satan loveth such saints, and accounteth them his dear darlings who destroy their own bodies and souls and deprive themselves of all the blessings of God's gifts. . . . The more holy we were, the more were we blinded, and the more did we worship the devil.'

Christian's answer to this confession of faith begins with the direct assertion that the faith is fantastical—*i.e.* constructed by fantasy, or fancy, instead of being drawn from and founded on 'the Word.' The argument is really directed against a greater than this poor pilgrim. As we have seen, this faith was constructed by the fantasy of a great Church, which notoriously denied to its members the right of direct access to the Word. In another respect also was Roman Catholic theology fantastical. It was as remote from the actual facts of life and experience as it was from the Scriptures themselves.

Doubtless it is this wider reference that explains the severity of Christian's speech—this, and also his memory of his handling by the Flatterer, who had said in effect the same thing to him as Ignorance. And John Bunyan himself, with his tremendous conviction of sin, and his pitiless far insight into it, had no point in common with a man like this, whose conceit or self-complacency rendered all true sense of sin impossible to him.

These were the days, it may be frankly admitted, when it took some knowledge of theology to make an accredited believer. The theology was complicated and exact, and (as we see plainly from *Cromwell's Letters*) all believers had to be theologians. Nowadays we do not demand, and very few of us could profess, such an elaborately scientific groundwork of theology for our faith. Yet the whole matter is summed up in one distinction, and that is permanent, and as vital to-day as then. The question, in the last analysis, is between self and Christ, works and grace. That is the evangelical crux of faith. It is quite true that 'character is salvation,' and that goodness is goodness all the world over. Yet the fact remains that the more character and goodness we have, the less we are satisfied with it, and the more surely we are driven back on the redeeming love of God in Jesus Christ. For every advance in character only reveals more surely the infinite stretch of moral height and depth. And the more hopelessly we realize this, the more urgently do we feel our need of One to

cast ourselves out on, good and evil alike, that we may lose all, and so find all in His redeeming love. Thus we may still assent to Cheever's exposition: 'Christ will be our only Saviour, or none at all. But there are many who, like Ignorance, profess to rest upon Christ, but make Him only half their Saviour, relying on their own holiness also for acceptance before God. This is a very dangerous error, as in the instance of Ignorance, for it proceeds from self-conceit; and even while under its influence men still think that they hold to the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith. . . . But who does not see that such a faith as this makes Christ not a Saviour of ourselves but of our duties?' Coleridge wrote the satirical label over a collection of tracts advocating such doctrine, 'Redemption made easy; or, Every man his own Saviour.' Kerr Bain wittily says of it, 'He does not profess to make out the £1, but 15s. is tolerably good money, while the 5s., at the least, is systematically furnished by One who has abundance . . . and there is an end of all trouble.' Mason's note on the passage, referring to the question between self or Christ, is, 'Reader, for thy soul's sake, look to thy foundation.'

Antinomianism.

Ignorance at once seizes on the obvious danger besetting all doctrines of free grace. 'If we are to trust simply in what Christ has done, we shall grow careless as to what we ourselves are doing.' The furious onslaught of Christian is very natural, but is not happy. For once Bunyan's righteous indignation has lost him a chance. For the danger is a real one, and the question is (unfortunately in the light of many instances) both natural and proper. After all, character *is* salvation, and there is a very real danger in any way of presenting Christianity that would seem even to the most ignorant kind of man to disparage character. There is a popular hymn which contains the lines:

> Doing is a deadly thing,
> Doing ends in death.

And Joannes Agricola's Calvinism leads him to the confident assurance that—

> I have God's warrant, could I blend
> All hideous sins, as in a cup,
> To drink the mingled venoms up;
> Secure my nature will convert
> The draught to blossoming gladness fast.

It is easy to see how dangerous such ideas may be in ill-balanced natures and untrained consciences. And it was not unnatural, nor in the least degree discreditable, that Ignorance should have found a difficulty here. Christian might have explained, as he was very well qualified to do, how the sense of sin grows with growing character; how compelling is the point of honour to Christ involved in faith, how love is the strongest of all safeguards against temptation. But Christian was tired of Ignorance by this time, and Bunyan was growing impatient. It is not easy to suffer fools gladly, nor to suffer them long. And, after all is said, it takes a bigger mind, and a more sincere conscience, than those of Ignorance to discuss such subjects. Christian, by his direct assault, was trying in a last endeavour to frighten or to anger him into a state of mind wherein he might hope to see plain truths and deal with them.

Contributions and Comments.

The Tone of Galatians ii. 1–10.

These verses, even as compared with their context, give the impression of having been written under peculiar excitement. It is as if Paul feared that certain historical facts, which he has to recall and admit, put him in the wrong, or at any rate exposed him to be misunderstood. The very fantastic suggestion has been heard of, that v.[3] implies the circumcision of Titus by St. Paul! Assuredly such a 'fact' as that is inconceivable. But is there not a more obvious explanation of the Apostle's uneasiness? May not the mere act of consulting the Church at Jerusalem have seemed to him, both at the time and in retrospect, like a dangerous compromising of his own independence and of what hung thereon—the freedom of the Gentile gospel? We might conjecture the sequence of events to have been: (1) A proposal made by others, that a deputation should visit Jerusalem (Ac 15[2]). (2) Refusal on St. Paul's part. (3) Possibly an argument—say, by Barnabas—that the

whole work among the Gentiles might be undermined unless the Jerusalem apostles could be induced to disown the Judaizers (Gal 2^{2d}). (4) Paul still unconvinced. (5) A vision which he accepts as a revelation (2^{2a})—God wills it!

It might, however, be held that Paul designedly excludes just such a view as we have in Ac 15—was that view already current?—and asserts that he had not consulted the Church as a Church; only the leaders privately (Gal 2^{2c}), and them merely in the interests of his mission-work. In order to avoid terrible risk to his converts—for the Master's sake, and at the Master's command—he imperilled his independence, and acquiesced in the lesser risk, that Jerusalem might seem to have an authority over Gentile churches which it by no means possessed.

I take for granted, in spite of clever writing on the other side, the identity of the visit to Jerusalem in Ac 15 with that in Gal 2. Yet one may hold it more than possible that the 'decree' is misdated in Ac 15, and belongs historically to a later year; cf. Ac 21^{25}, when Paul is informed of what 'we have written.'

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Manchester.

2 Thessalonians iii. 14, 15.

WITH a characteristic touch of aloofness, Marcus Aurelius (6^{20}) observes that if a man behaves roughly and rudely ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις, we do not display any exasperation; καίτοι φυλαττόμεθα, οὐ μέντοι ὡς ἐχθρόν. We simply avoid him in a dignified way. So in life, he adds, when we meet persons of this temper; ἔξεστι ἐκκλίνειν καὶ μήτε ὑποπτεύειν μήτε ἀπέχθεσθαι. Paul tells the Christians of Thessalonica (2 Th $3^{14.\ 15}$) also, if they find any member of the church refractory, τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε, μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐντραπῇ· καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν. The emperor has no room for the motive, ἵνα ἐντραπῇ. He simply gives a negative counsel, which recognizes no duty of remonstrance towards the offender ὡς ἀδελφόν. The Stoic individualism and the Christian sense of obligation towards a brother are thrown into sharp contrast by the very similarity of the phrase underlined and of the situation under review.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Broughty Ferry.

John xi. 43.

WHY, at the grave of Lazarus, did Jesus cry with a loud voice? The word ἐκραύγασε is not used elsewhere of our Lord, except negatively in Mt 12^{19}, quoting Is 42^{2}. Various good reasons are given by commentators, but none I have seen commends itself more than a suggestion by Isho'dad, Bishop of Merv, a Syriac commentator of the ninth century, whose work I am at present editing. I translate the passage thus:

'*He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth!* not that the voice was useful to the dead man, but that the bystanders might know that the Soul was far away from its body, and not inside the grave with it.'

The Egyptians were accustomed to think of the *Ka*, the principal part of the soul, as haunting the tomb. This superstition was doubtless prevalent amongst all nations that had come under Egyptian influence. That it persisted into Christian times may be seen from a passage in a poetical sermon by Narsai, a Syriac writer of the fifth century, and a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia. He describes Joseph, on his way to Egypt as a slave, weeping at the tomb of Rachel and hearing her voice speaking to him. One cannot be quite sure that this same superstition is dead yet. I know a widow lady, an eminent Christian, who was grieved to hear that a manufactory was to be erected at a little distance from the churchyard where the remains of her husband lie, because it would spoil his view! Is it not possible that Isho'dad may be right, and that it was to guard against this natural but heathenish impulse of the human heart, that Jesus cried with a loud voice?

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

P.S.—I see that Matthew Henry has something of the same idea.

The Cursing of the Fig-Tree.

A DIFFICULTY has always been felt with the Gospel story of the cursing of the barren fig-tree. St. Mark (11^{12-14}) records that Jesus being hungry saw a fig-tree with leaves, and went up to it in the hope of finding fruit, but that He found nothing but leaves, 'for,' it is added, 'the time of figs was not yet.' Thereupon He said: 'Let no man hence-

forward ever eat fruit of thee.' St. Matthew's (21[18-20]) account is similar, only that he mentions that it was a solitary fig-tree by the wayside, and that he omits the explanatory clause, 'the time of figs was not yet.'

In both narratives what is in view is unquestionably the so-called 'early *or* first figs.' The proper harvest season of figs is in the month of August, and these figs are hence called 'summer figs'; but, the fig-tree being as exacting of attention as the olive is the reverse, it very frequently happens that, where this attention has not been paid to it, or where the tree bears too much fruit, many figs do not ripen in August, but afterwards come to maturity in the spring, if the weather conditions are not too unfavourable. Thus it may be said with a measure of truth that the fig-tree bears fruit or, at least, fruit-buds throughout the whole year. This fruit, indeed, is only half ripe at the Passover season, when the incident in question occurred. But in the East even unripe fruit is eaten, and that indeed with special relish. Seeing that the fig-tree was rich in foliage, Jesus might rightly expect to find fruit, although only half ripe, upon it, and thus be able temporarily to satisfy His hunger. Not, indeed, as used to be assumed and as one still hears too often asserted, that the fig-tree bears fruit *before* leaves. Such is not the case, for then the name 'fruit' would be given to fruit-buds the size of a pea or, at most, of a bean. Now, the proper 'time of figs' is in August, so that in this month a leafy tree without fruit-buds, which have their origin in May, is impossible (such is the meaning of the statement, 'the time of figs was not yet'). On the other hand, figs growing out of the buds of the previous year are already ripe in spring, and hence are called 'early figs.' Trees without such, which yet are rich in foliage, may still be met with, although only seldom. Most of the early figs, indeed, drop off while immature, because they are displaced by the summer figs in their progress.

J. BOEHMER.

Fürstenfelde (Neumark).

James ii. 8.

THE ordinary rendering of *νόμον βασιλικόν* as 'royal law' has never seemed to me to convey a very definite impression; and I do not remember to have seen the suggestion that the words might be rendered 'the law of the kingdom,' a translation which would be singularly applicable to the phrase of which it is the description, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' It is plain from such a passage as Ac 17[7], in which St. Paul is charged with preaching 'another king, one Jesus' at Thessalonica, compared with 1 Th 2[12], 'that calleth you into his own kingdom and glory,' that the teaching of 'the Kingdom of God' played a considerable part in the apostolic message, even in Gentile cities, and to an audience largely Gentile by whom it would not be readily understood: is it not probable that such teaching would be still more prominent in a community of Jewish Christians who would readily understand the meaning, and some of whom might have heard the expression from the lips of the Master Himself? I must leave it to better scholars than myself to decide whether the Greek will bear the rendering; but if it will, the passage seems to me to gain force and clearness.

M. LINTON SMITH.

The Vicarage, Blundellsands.

'The Sod Bible.'

THE Oxford University Press is renowned for the beauty and accuracy of its Bibles, and that with full right. Yet this time it has added a new specimen to the odd Bibles already produced. In 1717 it produced the 'Vinegar Bible' (Lk 20, 'vinegar' for 'vineyard'); 1801, the 'Murderer Bible' (Jude [16], 'murderers' for 'murmurers'); 1807, the 'Ears to Ear Bible' (Mt 13[43], 'ears to ear'); 1810, the 'Wife-hater's Bible' (Lk 14[26], 'wife' for 'life'); and now the 'Sod Bible' (Dt 32[15], 'SOD' for 'GOD'); see *The Companion Bible*, being the Authorized Version of 1611, with the Structures and Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Suggestive. Part I., The Pentateuch, with 52 Appendices—Henry Frowde: Oxford University Press (no date! but end of 1909).

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The First Female Martyr.

STEPHEN has in the Church the *epitheton ornans* *πρωτομάρτυρ*, the first martyr; see, on the word 'Martyr,' Hastings in his *D.B.*, iii. 278, and on 'Protomartyr,' Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, ii.

875, 1018. But who was the first female martyr? In one sense we might so call Mary, remembering Lk 2^{35}, 'A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also.' But who was the first woman actually put to death for Christ's sake of whom we know? I wonder whether it was not the wife of Peter? At least, Clement of Alexandria (†between 211 and 216) tells in an interesting passage (*Stromata*, vii. 63; iii. 46 in the new edition of Stählin), repeated by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 30. 2):

'Some say, the blessed Peter saw his wife, when she was led to death (ἀγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θάνατον, Eusebius, ἀπαγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ), and rejoiced because of her calling and her return to home ἥσθῆναι μὲν τῆς κλήσεως χάριν καὶ τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῆς), but called her to exhort and comfort her (ἐπιφωνῆσαι δὲ εὖ μάλα προτρεπτικῶς καὶ παρακλητικῶς), naming her by her name (ἐξ ὀνόματος προσειπόντα): O you, remember the Lord (μέμνησο, ὦ αὕτη, τοῦ Κυρίου).' Clement adds: 'Such was the married life of the blessed and their perfect behaviour to the most loved' (τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ τῶν μακαρίων γάμος καὶ ἡ μέχρι τῶν φιλτάτων τελεία διάθεσις). Clement himself is not sure about the story, as he introduces it by φασί, it is told; and it has recently been suggested that he made a slight mistake: the original might have been that Peter saw her (not when she was led to death, but) when he was led this way (ἀγόμενον, not ἀγομένην). Be this as it may, the question is not without interest: Who is the first woman of whom martyrdom is expressly told?

Eb. Nestle,
Maulbronn.

The 'Vulgate' of Prof. Henslow.

I.

By the Rev. Albert Condamin, S.J., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis.

'The work is characterized by thoroughness, and is of great exegetical value' (*Dundee Courier*). I am afraid that the reader of the following remarks will have less confidence in the value, either exegetical or otherwise, of the little book of Professor Henslow, *The Vulgate the Source of False Doctrines* (1909), in which he calls for a 'recasting' of the Church's doctrines vitiated, as he says, by the influence of the Vulgate.

1. *Professor Henslow's ideas of the Vulgate are very vague.*—One might doubt that he really understands it to be the work of St. Jerome, were it not that he says: 'The editions of the Vulgate in my possession are entitled as follows: (1) *Biblica* (sic) *Sacra* vulgatæ editionis Sixti V.' (p. vii).

But the work of St. Jerome was completed in 404 A.D., and was adopted only gradually during the succeeding centuries (cf. the excellent article 'Vulgate' by H. J. White, M.A., in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*). How, then, could Professor Henslow make the following statements? 'The knowledge of the Bible in the early centuries of our era was based entirely upon the Vulgate . . .' (p. vi); and especially: 'What has been the consequence of this wrong translation by the Vulgate of μετάνοια? It gave rise to the whole penitential system of Church discipline. It began in the Greek Church, and was followed by the North African and Roman, in which it was dignified as a sacrament. Let us read Tertullian's description of its several elements' (p. 74). How was the Vulgate (finished in 404 A.D.) able to exert an influence, first upon the Greek Church (!), and, *after that*, upon Tertullian, who died about 240 or 245 A.D.?

St. Jerome had translated the Psalms from the Hebrew; but this translation forms no part of the Vulgate, which, for the Psalms, has kept the old Latin version revised by St. Jerome. F. G. Kenyon says very well in a clear and concise article of the new single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by J. Hastings: in the Vulgate 'the Canonical Books of the O.T., except the Psalms, were Jerome's fresh translation from the Massoretic Hebrew' (art. 'Vulgate,' p. 960^{b}). Professor Henslow does not even seem to suspect this, for, quoting a Psalm, he writes: 'Jerome's translation is said to have been from the Hebrew, but the above seems to show that this passage is from one of the older Latin versions, from the LXX' (p. 20, n. 1). And elsewhere, speaking of Pss 112, 118: 'This shows that the Vulgate was translated from the LXX' (p. 114, n. 1).

2. *Professor Henslow identifies the Vulgate with the 'Index Biblicus.'*—The *Index Biblicus*, published for the first time in 1571 A.D., possesses no official character. The edition of Tournai of 1885 says: 'Indices biblicos, quos omisit cl. Vercellone, *quasi intolerabilis tædii laborisque esset eos ut decet corrigere*, incredibili labore purgare non

abhorruimus . . .' Professor Henslow uses an *Index Biblicus* published in 1844, and confounds it with the Vulgate.

'*Satisfactio*,' he says, 'is one of the few ecclesiastical terms which does not occur in the Vulgate . . . In the *Index Biblicus* the reader is referred to *pœnitentia*' (p. 30; cf. p. 77). But, in reality, *satisfactio* does occur in the Vulgate.

On pages 9 and 10 the author cites a sentence of the *Index Biblicus*, and criticizes the sentence as quoted, saying: 'The mistake of the Vulgate is twofold,' and he adds as a proof other passages of the *Index Biblicus*. His reasoning is the same for the word 'merit.' He claims that the word is due to the Vulgate, and for proof cites the *Index Biblicus* referring to Psalms in which, as a matter of fact, the Vulgate does not employ the word 'merit,' neither *meritum* nor *mereri* (pp. 113–114). *Index Biblicus* is further cited on pages 38, 57, 92, 102, 127.

Elsewhere his argumentation is based on the *marginal notes* of the Rheims version (p. 18; cf. 17, and 21, 22, 23, 24). For him all this is the Vulgate![1]

3. *Many other chapters are outside the subject* (the book has 18 chapters, in 136 little pages).—Chap. vi. The doctrine of Redemption rejected here does not depend upon the Vulgate, as it was held by the Greek Fathers before the fifth century.[2]

All of chap. vii. (pp. 45–53) is irrelevant; for the Rev. G. Henslow admits that 'the Greek word is καταλλαγή, which is rightly translated *reconciliatio* in the Vulgate' (p. 46). The whole chapter is against the meaning given to the word *atonement* through Calvin's influence.

In chap. viii., pages 54–55 do not attack the Vulgate, because, according to the Rev. G. Henslow, 'this error ["salvation" = "safety from hell"] has prevailed to the present day, whereas salvation from sin means, as the Vulgate indeed translates it, *salus*, *i.e.* the spiritual health of the soul' (p. 56).

Neither do pages 56–71 inculpate the Vulgate, for, in the opinion of Professor Henslow, the great Eucharistic error of the Church is transubstantiation (pp. 60–63, 65, 66, 67, 69–71). But, 'it is quite clear,' he affirms, 'that the idea of transubstantiation included under *Eucharistia* was, from the above, attributable to the word *is* in "This *is* my body"' (p. 57). But the verb *is* occurs as well in the Greek N.T. as in the Vulgate: Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου (Mk 14^{22}, Mt 26^{26}, Lk 22^{19}). The Vulgate, therefore, is not responsible for this great 'error.'

Chap. ix. (Repentance) treats of the influence of the Vulgate upon the Greek Church before Tertullian! etc. (see above).

Chap. x. The doctrine of Purgatory is founded, the author thinks, on 'the erroneous idea of a *material* instead of a *metaphorical* meaning of fire' in 1 Co 3^{13-15}; he cites in a note the Greek οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. It is hard to see how the Vulgate is more responsible than the Greek text for the meaning given to the word *fire*.

In chap. xi. (Confession) the Rev. G. Henslow reproaches the Vulgate for using the expression *confessio fidei* in place of *professio fidei*. What significance can this have as regards the sacrament of Penance? especially when he concedes: 'The Vulgate is right in using *confiteor* and *confessio* in connexion with sin. . . . The doctrinal errors connected with the word arose much later in the history of the Church' (p. 89).

The following chapters are no stronger because Professor Henslow always forgets to prove his statement: the doctrines 'have really arisen from erroneous interpretations of the Greek words' (Preface, p. v). He does not show that *justifico* is a bad translation of δικαιόω (chap. xii.); nor that *prædestino* renders incorrectly προορίζω (chap. xvi.). In chap. xvi. he argues against the interpreters of the Epistle to the Romans (p. 121), *not against the Vulgate*.

The whole chap. xiv. is directed against the explanation of Mt 16^{19} and the 'power of the keys' as derived from this text,—*not against the Vulgate*.

Chap. xv. acknowledges that *reconciliatio* and 'regeneration' [Vulg. *regeneratio*] give the correct meaning of the Greek words. As regards 'merit' in the same chapter, see above.

4. *Mistakes in Greek*.—On p. 98 (cf. 141) we read: 'The verb ὑπερείδω, *to overlook*' (for ὑπεροράω, aor. ὑπερεῖδον). Ἐλυτρώσατο (p. 37), he derives from ἐλυτρόω (p. 141).

[1] The Vulgate has *not* the words attributed to it, p. 41, n. 3: *detque animam suam in redemptionis pretium pro multis*.

[2] Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc., hold the doctrine of satisfaction and substitution; see J. Rivière, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*, 1905, chaps. ix. x. xi. (There is an English translation of the book.)

I give entire the following curious instance of reasoning about a passage from Ps 40:

'If we now turn to the LXX, we at once see how the words "A body thou wilt fit for me" are obviously inserted:

> Sacrifice and offering thou willest not,
> [But a body thou wilt furnish for me]
> Holocausts also for sin thou askest not for.'

'In the Latin version the translator has changed the *future* tense into the *past: Hostiam et oblationem* noluiste (sic), *corpus autem aptasti mihi* (A victim and oblation thou *hast not wished for*, but a body hast thou fitted for me)' (pp. 19, 20).

But (*a*), the words in brackets are not *inserted*: either they rest on a text variant (Briggs, *The Book of Psalms*, in 'The International Critical Commentary,' vol. i. p. 355); or they are 'a free interpretation of the original text' (Westcott, on Heb. 10^5, 3rd ed., p. 310^b). (*b*) There is *no future* in the Greek text, but three aorists ἠθέλησας, κατηρτίσω and ᾔτησας, as there are three perfects in Hebrew. (*c*) The future ought to be, according to Professor Henslow's translation, in the *second* line, but when he quotes the Latin he emphasizes the verb of the *first* line.

In his discussion on ἱλάσκεσθαι the author would have done well to consult Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 2nd ed., 1903, pp. 224–225 and 124–135.

5. *A remarkable translation from Latin.*—The words of the reference phrase of the *Index Biblicus*, 'Eucharistia sub altera tantum, nimirum panis specie' (the Eucharist under one species (form) only, namely, the species (form) of bread . . .), are taken for a complete sentence and translated, 'The Eucharist [is][1] without doubt, only bread under another form'!! (p. 57).

6. *A new formula of Anathema.*—'Valde Anathema sit,' 'let him be strongly accursed,' is given as the ending of a decree of the Council of Trent (p. 60). But no Council has ever used the formula '*Valde A. S.*' Moreover, the translation is inaccurate, as the word has, long since, lost its original signification, and only means: Let him be excommunicated.

The present remarks are perhaps sufficient, though many others could be added. The reader will appreciate the thoroughness and exegetical power of Professor Henslow!

[1] Brackets are his.

II.

By Professor GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A., F.G.S.

MR. CONDAMIN has already *twice* noticed my book in *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*; we now get a more detailed account of my *textual* errors. They are easily accounted for (omitting slips and printer's mistakes). I make no pretension whatever to be a Latin, Greek, or Hebrew scholar, nor to know anything of exegesis; but I asked myself, Why are so many doctrinal terms (*e.g.*, 'oblation,' 'satisfaction,' 'propitiation,' etc.) derived from *Latin* and not Greek words, as are 'Church,' 'Ecclesiastical,' and 'Eucharist'? I naturally turned to the Vulgate; and therein I found words which did *not* correspond with the Greek. Thus, will any more expert Greek scholar tell me if μετανοέω conveys the *inherent meaning* of 'punishment' conveyed by *pœnitentia*, and is the Douay Version 'faithfully translated into English out of the authentical Latin,' etc., correct, in writing 'Doe pennance: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' . . . 'I baptize you in water vnto pennance'?

Mr. Condamin notes that some of my objections are *not* due to the Vulgate. I never said that *all* of the false doctrines still held were so. Thus, I should like to see 'Salvation' replaced by Wicklif's 'Health,' a correct rendering of the Vulgate *salus*. So, too, 'Atonement' has lost its true meaning of 'At-one-ment' or 'reconciliation' of the sixteenth century.

I thank Mr. Condamin for calling my attention to my *textual* errors; but why does he not make a like attack upon *my exposure of false doctrines*? I have told him by letter that *he dare not do this*; and this present criticism proves I am right. As a proof I appeal to the reviewer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, who wrote—'It is really a good strong Protestant polemic. . . . Under each doctrinal heading there is very plain statement of the false teaching of the Roman Church, and the reason for it. . . . A simple example is Repentance—v. *pœnitentia*, whence penance and all the agony of hair shirts.'

I will repeat what I wrote to Mr. Condamin, that he suggests a likeness to some art critic, who instead of dealing with the *picture*, finds fault with the *frame*.

Was the Baptist loyal to Jesus?

Why did not the Baptist himself follow Jesus? Why, feeling, as he did, the inward sense of sin, did he not follow the Lamb of God? Why, feeling, as he said, his need of being baptized of Christ, did he not seek from Him the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire? Why, having preached the advent of the kingdom, was he content to remain without,—less than the least within it? Why did he continue to hold around him a school of those who attached themselves to him in preference to following the greater leader? And why did he continue to administer the ordinance of baptism, and so perpetuate, long after both he and Jesus had passed away, a Baptist communion which knew only the baptism of repentance and had not so much as heard of the Holy Ghost?

It has been suggested by Dr. Lambert (in Hastings's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 865[a]) that John was perfectly loyal to Christ in all this, but felt that there was still need for a work of preparation, and room, therefore, for a discipleship to the Forerunner. And, indeed, one can well understand that a work like John's could not be finished all of a sudden, and that energies like John's could not sink back into inaction. No doubt, too, it would take time to effect the transference of his followers to Jesus; time, too, for the work of Jesus to attain to the same proportions, and to bulk as largely in the public eye, as John's.

But the question still remains: Why could not the work of John have gone on *within* the circle of Christ's influence and under the shadow of His authority? Had Jesus no preparatory work to do which John could have done for Him? Are we not expressly told that in the beginning, at least, the message of Jesus was precisely that of John—'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand'? And was it not the best way to arrest that work, and to keep it still only in the preparatory stage, for John himself to remain apart? Did he not thus form a different, and as we actually see a rival, centre, and so prevent, by the entering in of a spirit of jealousy and contention, the further transference of his adherents to the following of Jesus?

For my part, I cannot satisfy myself that John was wholly true to Jesus and to His mission. And I find in his doubting question sent to Jesus from the dungeon (Mt 11^3) the natural outcome of his great mistake. And in the answer of Jesus I find this view confirmed: 'Go and show John the things which ye do hear and see,' said Jesus to the deputation. And then He enumerated the things which they were to tell their master. What were these things? *Precisely the things which John would have seen for himself had he been of the company of Jesus.* This answer, indicating simply what John could have seen for himself, and no other answer to his question, was vouchsafed by Jesus.

JAS. B. RUSSELL.

Aberdeen.

John xii. 32–36.

THE usual way of explaining the words of Jn 12^{35}, 'Yet a little while is the light among you,' seems to be to make the reference to the Teacher so soon to be 'lifted up.' The previous conversation suggests another interpretation. The people have asked the meaning of the Christ 'who abideth for ever.' Jesus had said, 'The Son of man (namely, Himself) must be lifted up.' But, ask the people, what is the meaning of that Son of man, spoken of in the law, who does not die, but abides for ever, *i.e.* on earth? Dods and McClymont make the answer evasive. 'Don't trouble with these sophistries. Rather turn to the divine truth seeking you in My teaching.' But may not the reference well be to that 'light which lighteth every man coming into the world,' of John's Prologue? The people have asked for an explanation of the Son of man who abides in the world for ever. The direct answer is '*That* Son of man is the principle of light in the race. For a little while the Light is *in you* (ἐν ὑμῖν, ℵBDKL). Take the inspiration of your highest moments—when that inward divine light illuminates your soul, follow its leading that ye may indeed become 'children of light.' For the ethical application introduced in the reply of Jesus one may compare the first verse of Matthew Arnold's poem 'Morality':

> We cannot kindle when we will
> The fire which in the heart resides;
> The spirit bloweth and is still,
> In mystery our soul abides.
> But tasks in hours of insight willed
> Can be through hours of gloom fulfilled.'

H. BULCOCK.

Droylsden.

Entre Nous.

Sixty Years with the Bible.

Professor W. N. Clarke has written his autobiography. It is a history of his interest in the Bible. Whether things happened to him, or were done by him, not recorded here, we cannot tell. It seems as through Professor Clarke had lived his life with the Bible. *Sixty Years with the Bible* is his autobiography (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net).

Is he a Bibliolater, then? He is not a Bibliolater. His autobiography is a record of emancipation. He began with a doctrine of inspiration which did not admit the very possibility of contradiction in the Bible itself or between the Bible and any other true thing. He ended with a full acceptance of the historical method of its study.

His autobiography is a history of Bible study during the last sixty years. It is personal enough, but the personal in it is thoroughly representative. Only in one respect is it singular, that he has been so faithful. As soon as he saw the light he walked in it.

The influences were partly from without, partly from within. Of the outward influences, he refers to certain men without naming them. He refers also to Scrivener's *New Testament*, to Meyer's Commentaries, to *Essays and Reviews*, to Herbert Spencer's *First Principles*. Regarding the inward, he tells a most fascinating story of his discovery of the doctrine of the Atonement when he was forty years of age.

Here is a thing he did in the early days of his ministry: 'I asked my people to read the Bible through with me in a year, three chapters a day and five on Sunday, and promised them help from the pulpit as the reading went on. A good number accepted the invitation, and though some fell out by the way, Bible reading was a prominent feature in the life of the congregation in that year. I accompanied it with a course of Bible sermons, as I called them, each treating of a book in the Bible, or of a group of books.'

Perhaps the discovery which impressed him most was the discovery that the Canon of the Bible is not yet closed. Let him tell it: 'One Sunday evening there strolled in to hear me a pair of scientists with whom I had a slight acquaintance, one of them rather eminent in his generation. Afterward I wondered what they thought. I do not remember what my text was, but it was one of the condensed expressions of truth that abound in the First Epistle of St. John. I spoke of this Epistle as later in origin than the book that stands at the close of the Bible, and as occupying a place at the very end of the long course of divine revelation. I appealed to its testimony as the last and highest word, the ripened fruit of God's great revealing process, the very climax of that which has come from Him to His world of men. I spoke, in fact, as if nothing had been heard from God since that Epistle was written. I did not know at the time how far away I was putting God from His world. But the retributive power did not overlook me. After a while a wave of remembrance swept over me, to my humiliation, and I wondered what my scientific acquaintances thought that I, a Christian minister, believed about the living God. If they believed in God at all, as I think they did, they believed in a God who did not close His work of self-expression and betake himself to silence eighteen hundred years ago, but who "worketh hitherto," a God self-uttering as the light; and I had been addressing them as if God had been silent to men through all these ages. I wish I might have the opportunity of preaching to them now; but one of them is gone to the other life, and the other I shall never meet.'

In one place, near the end, he tells how it came about that he had to write and wrote the book which made him famous (he does not say it made him famous), his *Outline of Christian Theology*. 'In the next three years I rewrote my treatise three times, enlarging it each time. In the fourth year I rewrote it again, and printed it. A few years later I revised and enlarged it once more, and it was published.'

Point and Illustration.

A book on *Labrador: The Country and the People* (Macmillan; 10s. net) may seem an unlikely quarry for the preacher, unless he remembers that the Moravians are there, or discovers that the writer of the book is Dr. Wilfred Grenfell. Wilfred T. Grenfell, C.M.G., M.R.C.S., M.D., (Oxon.), is the writer of the greater part of the book,

but there are chapters by other men in it—a chapter on the geology by Mr. Reginald A. Daly; a chapter on the Indians by Mr. Williams B. Cabot; chapters on the birds, the flora, the insects, by other men; and a chapter on the marine crustacea by a lady, Mary J. Rathbun. Every chapter, in short, is the work of an expert. And the full-page illustrations, which are many, are the work of an expert in photography. Therefore, if we do find illustrations in this book, we shall know that they are both original and reliable. Here are some of them.

Six Days shalt Thou Labour.

Canadian fishing vessels visiting Labrador from the lower provinces, are fewer than twenty years ago. Americans from Maine are more numerous. These, the finest fishing vessels by far that come amongst us, are always welcome. Their crews are a generous, open-handed crowd of men, thorough fishermen, and splendidly fitted out. Our own humble vessels look poor and sorry beside them. Only for one thing do we regret their advent, and that is due to their indifference to what we consider the laws of God. They go fishing and working on Sundays among our people, who, though poorer and far more needy of material wealth, are wise enough to know that life does not consist in the abundance of things man possesses. The joy of life on our coast comes of a peace of mind due to a real faith in God's Fatherhood and our sonship, and from every high ideal realized on that premise. Without any theories it is the simplest 'simple life.' There is no room in Labrador for persons affected with the 'dementia of owning things.' If ever by elimination of their faith, or by the introduction of the 'habits of civilization,' our people are deprived of that faith, life would be little short of a purgatory to be endured. So strongly do our people feel on this matter of keeping Sunday strictly for rest, that one of our laws runs that 'no person shall, between the hours of twelve o'clock on Saturday night and twelve o'clock on Sunday night, take or catch in any manner whatsoever, any herring, caplin, squid, or any other bait fish, or set or put out any contrivance whatsoever for taking them,'—just such a law as prevailed one hundred years ago about salmon-catching in Ireland. Oddly enough the law does not prevent catching the cod themselves, so we cannot prevent the long lines being hauled by our cousins from 'civilization.' When remonstrated with, however, they have almost always shown enough good feeling to give way to the wishes and customs of our people.

No Policemen.

Thousands of our fishermen are absolute abstainers on principle, and a very strong anti-liquor sentiment prevails almost universally. The results are obvious in the fact that we have not one policeman stationed along the whole coast; not one among twenty-five thousand. We have no penitentiary, and there has not been, to my knowledge, a conviction for drunkenness. During sixteen years I have personally not seen one fisherman drunk. It is very different among the North Sea fishermen. Alcohol has there been the downfall of some of the best men. It has cost the lives of more than one of my own friends. It has ruined and starved many families I have known and loved.

A careful study of the health conditions of the coast by the doctors of our staff all these years has shown that there is no need for liquor whatever in these subarctic climates; that, on the contrary, the first man to go down in hard physical conditions is almost always the drinking man. Among men on the sea the dangers from its use are enormously enhanced. As a method of making money, I can conceive of few that are so despicable, so inhuman, as this liquor traffic!

A Moravian Missionary.

The missionary in charge at present is a splendid specimen of humanity, broad and strong far beyond the average man, with merry blue eyes, and the abundant light hair of a Viking. He has a capacity for work, and an accuracy of mind rarely equalled. His hospitality and generous manner toward strangers, along with all his other splendid qualities, make him the ideal man for the environment. One could imagine that he had dropped off an ancient 'war swan,' and had persisted ever since those days on these seemingly God-forsaken rocks. The man's scorn of physical conditions, the hard things that he has moulded to his will, and the absolute happiness he always seems to enjoy, have shown to me, each time I have visited the station, how man, as God would have him be, towers above his circumstances. One leaves the station regretting that so few

should be there to benefit, humbled and glad that men of such type still live to adorn the human race.

Looking after strayed Presbyterians.

The Rev. Donald Matheson, who is doing most successful work in Oxford in connexion with Presbyterian undergraduates, is credited, says the *Christian World*, with a pleasant wit. At a University reception, the Archbishop of York, who is an old schoolfellow of Mr. Matheson, introduced him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and while the three were chatting together, Dr. Lang asked Mr. Matheson, 'What are you doing now in Oxford?' 'Oh,' replied Mr. Matheson, 'just looking after strayed Presbyterians.'

A Higher Critic.

It was in a Scotch schoolroom, where a class was being examined in Scripture knowledge by H.M. Inspector. 'Can any boy or girl here tell me how Noah would be likely to use his time while in the ark?' asked the Inspector. There was silence for some time, but at length one boy timidly showed his hand, and, on being asked what he thought, replied, 'Please, sir, he wad fish.' 'Well, yes, he might,' admitted the Inspector. Presently another little fellow was seen to wave his hand excitedly, and on being asked to speak, said, 'Please, he couldna fish verra lang.' 'What makes you think so, my little man?' asked the Inspector. 'Because there were only twa worms.'

The Mother.

The Atlantic Monthly, Feb. 1910.

You struggled blindly for my soul
And wept for me such bitter tears,
That through your faith my faith grew whole
And fearless of the coming years.

For in the path of doubt and dread
You would not let me walk alone,
But prayed the prayers I left unsaid
And sought the God I did disown.

You gave to me no word of blame,
But wrapped me in your love's belief,
Dear love, that burnt my sin like flame,
And left me worthy of your grief.

HESTER I. RADFORD.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. J. Rose, M.A., Glenbervie, and the Rev. W. J. Grant, B.A., Katoomba, N.S. Wales, to whom copies of Scott's *Pauline Epistles* and of Dykes's *Divine Worker* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for May must be received by the 1st of April. The text is Rev 21^{27}.

The Great Text for June is Rev $22^{3.4}$—'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 22^{14}—'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' A copy of Walker's *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister and his Duties*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 22^{17}—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.' A copy of Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Ps 1^{3}—'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' A copy of Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Adams's *Israel's Ideal*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is a special article every week in the *Sunday School Times* of America written by some scholar of good repute. The article has usually something to do with the International Lesson for the week. In the issue for the 15th of January this year the Lesson is on 'Some Laws of the Kingdom,' being taken from the fifth chapter of St. Matthew, vv.[17-26. 38-48]. The author of the special article is Professor HARNACK.

'Did Jesus do away with the Old Testament Law?' That is the title of the article. Professor HARNACK answers his own question at once. Jesus did not do away with the Old Testament Law. The notion that He did, 'is largely entertained,' but it is refuted by the Gospels. Not only may Mt 5[17. 18] be quoted against it, but a great many more passages and testimonies.

Can Professor HARNACK tell us, then, what was Christ's attitude to the Mosaic Law? He is quite sure he can. He states it in five particulars: (1) Jesus recognized the Law and the Prophets as a part of the inspired and authoritative Scriptures; (2) He derived His proofs from the Old Testament; (3) in doing so He followed the same method as His contemporaries; (4) He promised salvation to those who obeyed the Decalogue; and (5) He also approved of and desired the observance of the ceremonial Law. The testimonies to all these things are 'so numerous and distinct in the Gospels as to leave no room for doubt.'

And that Jesus did these things is proved by the fact that after the Resurrection His disciples did them. They went up to the Temple daily; they were zealous for the Law. That they should have continued to do this against the custom or the command of their Master is 'highly improbable.'

'But do not the Gospels contain very many passages and incidents in which Jesus broke with the Law?' Professor HARNACK supposes that some one will put that question to him. 'Very many?' he retorts. 'This is not correct.' For most of the passages that are quoted in that sense are simply misinterpreted. When correctly interpreted, they are found to contradict not the authority of Moses, but only the traditions of the Pharisees. It is true that when He forbade divorce Jesus opposed a permission granted by Moses, but in doing so He grounded His prohibition on an older law.

But what will Professor HARNACK do with words like these: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time—but I say unto you'? He answers unhesitatingly that the reference is not to Moses. It was not Moses that said to them

of old time, this and that, it was the Scribes. 'Jesus would remind His disciples of what the Scribes had for generations been teaching the people.' His purpose, accordingly, was to explain the will of God as expressed in the law of Moses, but to reject the superficial Scribal interpretation of it.

There remains the incident of the plucking of corn on the Sabbath and our Lord's justification of it. Professor HARNACK does not deny that this incident was a transgression of the Fourth Commandment; and he does not deny that Jesus justified it. But how did He justify it? Out of the Old Testament. He appealed to the Old Testament itself, which allowed a deviation from the law of the Sabbath under special circumstances. Professor HARNACK omits to show that the present circumstances were special. He simply adds that 'consequently the words, "Pray ye that your flight be not on the Sabbath day," may also be regarded as genuine, for, as a rule, the law of the Sabbath was to be respected.'

And no sooner has Professor HARNACK proved in this way that Jesus did not do away with the Old Testament law than he proceeds to prove that He did. Without a word of warning he suddenly turns round and says that 'there are some passages—not many, indeed, though this is of little consequence—which are in conflict with the Mosaic Law.' What are these passages?

They are such familiar passages, taken from the same Sermon on the Mount, as 'Swear not at all,' and 'Resist not evil.' When He said 'Swear not at all,' Jesus 'overthrew this part of the Mosaic Law.' So, 'when He tells us not to avenge ourselves, nor to return evil for evil, He opposes that fundamental principle of the law which demands an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' Again, 'when He requires us to love our enemies, He antagonizes the law according to which they are to be hated.' When 'He seeks still further to defend His deviation from the law of the Sabbath by declaring that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, He corrects the law by advancing a new view of the law.' When 'He maintains that a man is not defiled by whatsoever entereth into him from without, He thereby proclaims the Levitical laws regarding purifications superfluous.' And, finally, 'when He associates with the unclean, with publicans and harlots, and touches a leper, and goes into the house of a heathen, He places Himself above the law, not only in word but also in deed.'

What does Professor HARNACK mean by contradicting himself in this way? He denies that he contradicts himself. The contradiction, he says, is due to Jesus. There the passages stand. Some of them show that Jesus did not desire to do away with the Mosaic Law, some of them show that He did. And it is not that He upheld the Law in its main features and abolished certain subordinate parts of it. For, says Professor HARNACK, 'the Law is a unity; whosoever transgresses it in part, or indeed but at *a single point*, thereby annuls the whole.' Nor is it that at first He taught the absolute validity of the Law, and at a later period its abrogation, Professor HARNACK would be quite satisfied with such a solution as that. But it is not to be had. For at the close of His ministry Jesus spoke words in confirmation of the Law just as He did at the beginning.

How is it, then, that sometimes Jesus upheld the Law, and sometimes He contradicted it? Professor HARNACK answers that when Jesus contradicted the Law of Moses He did not know that He was contradicting it.

Jesus was a prophet. Like the prophets before Him, He was not conscious of contradiction between what He taught and the written Law. He was in direct communication with God. He spoke that which was given Him to speak. Being confident that He had the mind of the Lord, it was not His business to consider whether His teaching agreed with the Law or not. That was the business of

God. And in actual fact, says Professor HARNACK, He had no idea that it did not agree.

So, if the teaching of Jesus went beyond the Law of Moses and at last dissolved it, the explanation is that He builded better than He knew. Has it not been so, says Professor HARNACK, with other reformers? Was it not so with Luther? 'Luther was in many things still a loyal son of the Church and the Pope, even after his evangelical-reformatory consciousness had already become strongly developed. When he wrote his splendid book on *The Freedom of a Christian Man*, he still believed that the Catholic Church was the true Church of Christ. It remained for his adversaries to show him how far he had already broken with the Church, and how he was engaged in an effort to destroy the Church. This he had not perceived, nor did he care to do so. On the contrary, he really thought that with this new freedom of his he could remain in the old Church because he loved it.'

'With due allowances,' says Professor HARNACK, 'we must assume the same regarding Jesus.' And he sums up the whole situation by affirming that '*objectively* the attitude of Jesus toward the Law involves a contradiction, but *subjectively*, that is for Himself, He was not conscious of it.'

Professor HARNACK'S article is dealt with in the *Biblical World* for March. It is dealt with by the editors. And the editors of the *Biblical World* see very clearly the issue that is raised by the article.

That issue is not the permanence of the Law. It is not the question whether or not Christ has brought us out of the bondage of the Law into the liberty of sons. In that respect St. Paul only reaped where Jesus had sown. It is not a matter of ethics, but of Christology; not what should be the Christian's attitude to the Law, but what was Christ's attitude, and how we are to rank Him in respect of ethical insight. The editors of the *Biblical World* come to the conclusion that Professor HARNACK'S interpretation of Jesus' attitude to the Law is critically and exegetically indefensible.

From the Oxford University Press there has been issued a volume on *The Inspiration of Prophecy* (3s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. G. C. JOYCE, D.D., Warden of S. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, and to be remembered as the author of some important articles in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.

The inspiration of Prophecy is but a part of the general subject of the inspiration of the Bible. It is a part that may quite properly be treated separately, and which has, in fact, been often so treated. The novelty of Dr. JOYCE'S book lies in the method of treatment. For the first time psychology is used, not by a layman, but by a systematic theologian, to explain the inspiration of the prophets.

Psychology has often been used to explain the facts of conversion. But the facts of conversion are not the same as the facts of inspiration. They differ in one most important respect. Conversion is the appropriation of spiritual truth already familiar to others. Inspiration is the communication of truth that is new to the world.

Now it is with extreme reluctance that theologians allow the entrance of Psychology into the region of things spiritual. The science is new. It is so new that some of them still deny it the name of science. Its use in the explanation of conversion has not always been wisely directed. The suspicion is strong that it comes as an ally of that great all-consuming movement of our day which is directed against the supernatural.

Dr. JOYCE is aware of the suspicion. He has had his share of it. But the suspicion with which Psychology is received is not greater than was the

hostility which Evolution had to encounter. Yet Evolution won its way and has become a good friend. Psychology must simply be directed aright. Dr. Joyce has studied the young science and applied it to the phenomena of inspiration, and he is no longer afraid. 'Recognizing and accepting the reality and authority of the revelation enshrined in the Bible, I am convinced that the fullest and freest inquiry into the various modes of Inspiration, so far from weakening faith, cannot but serve to increase our reverence for this work of the Holy Spirit among men.'

The suspicion, however, is due not altogether to the novelty of the science. It is due yet more to the circumstance that it is not the laws and rules of Psychology that are applied to religion, but only its abnormalities. Dr. Joyce does not deny this. He says: 'The psychology which we shall have to call to our aid has wider limits than that which forms the subject of the text-books, and which restricts itself to the consideration of the normal modes of attention, perception, association, and other functions of the mind. We must rather follow the guidance of those who have devoted themselves to the study of the human mind in its abnormal and its supernormal activities.'

But that is inevitable. Conversion is an abnormality. If inspiration were a normal activity of the human mind, it would not become the subject of special study; it would not receive a special name. It is just the abnormal in Hebrew or Christian Prophecy that is the subject of investigation. To apply to it only the rules of the text-books is simply to deny its existence. Dr. Joyce admits at once that it is not scientific psychology that he is to follow the laws of, but that later and perhaps less reputable study which goes by the name of 'Psychical Research.' For it is Psychical Research, he says, that 'has succeeded in establishing important conclusions with regard to the existence in man of faculties extending beyond the limitations of the normal consciousness.'

One question remains: Does Dr. Joyce propose to explain Prophecy as simply an abnormal psychological experience? That is his purpose. For that is his belief. But what then? He does not explain away Prophecy by calling it an abnormal psychological occurrence. He does not reduce it to the level of telepathy, which is also an abnormal psychological occurrence. There remains always the vast distinction of the agent. Telepathy is the influence of one man upon another. Prophecy is the work of God. The mode of operation may be the same in both. The difference is in the agent. And that difference is essential.

This is the very mistake that was made when the doctrine of Evolution was first suggested. A struggle arose over the mode of God's operation. Was it by the one great leap of Creation, or by the slow continuous process of Evolution? The struggle was beside the mark. To the theologian the method is of little account. This is the important thing that 'the worlds were framed by the Word of God.'

But now, it must not be supposed that the psychological interpretation of Prophecy is altogether a study in exceptions. In its full flower it is quite exceptional. But in its sources it is normal. Dr. Joyce has no doubt that the prophecies of Isaiah rose out of such humble psychological elements as crystal-gazing or casting the lot. And why not? 'If,' he says, 'an arboreal creature be man's ancestor in the physical line, why should we fear to recognize the soothsayer and the diviner as the ancestor of the prophet in the line of mental and spiritual development?'

And there is more than that. The psychological study of Prophecy discovers something of the way of God's working. It is a twofold way. He gives His revelation gradually. It is line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. But with the progress of the utterance comes the preparation of the ear to receive it. Just as the physical ear has advanced in delicacy

of perception and complexity of structure, so Dr. JOYCE believes there has been a corresponding advance in man's capacity for spiritual perception.

And then the question arises whether the forms of one age may not have survived into another. In the infancy of inspiration its modes are the vision, the dream, and the trance. The time comes when men are able to worship the Father in spirit and in truth. Is it possible that even then they may speak as if their new knowledge of God's will had come to them in a dream by night or a trance by day? It is possible. It is after the analogy of all human custom and experience.

Take the phrase 'Thus saith the Lord.' It is common in Amos. Dr. JOYCE believes that it expresses some actual 'substratum of mystical hearing.' In the prophets of the eighth century who succeeded Amos it is of much less frequent occurrence. But its frequency is restored in the prophets who saw the fall of Jerusalem and the Exile. Dr. JOYCE believes that the phrase had acquired 'in some measure a conventional use.' He says it would obviously be absurd to suppose that every time any one of the prophets took these words upon his lips he did so in virtue of some definite psychic experience in the way of audition.

Thus the field of psychological investigation is wide and hopeful. There is no question of the Agent. The inspiration may have come at sundry times and in divers manners, but it has always come from God. The province of the psychical is the life of man.

'Blessed are the meek.' But where are they? 'I was teaching the Sermon on the Mount to a Hindu student and friend. When we came to the words, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," he said to me, "Sir, the Englishman may inherit the earth, but if you call him meek he would be insulted."'

The Hindu was right. He would be insulted. 'Blessed are the meek' may be part of the Christianity of Christ, but it is no part of the Christianity of the Englishman in India. Where, then, are the meek? They are found among the Hindus themselves.

The incident just referred to is related in a volume entitled *The Interpretation of the Character of Christ to non-Christian Races*, which has been written by Canon C. H. ROBINSON (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). Here is another incident from the same volume: 'I may speak to an Englishman about an acquaintance, and say, "He is a really good man, though he has a hot temper," and the description will be accepted. If I speak to an Indian of a good man who loses his temper, a look of sheer bewilderment will come over his face. "What is goodness," he asks, "if it is not unruffled serenity and patience?"'

Now, if that is so, how are we to commend Christ to a Hindu? Canon ROBINSON answers that after a long experience of work in India, as well as among other non-Christian nations, he is convinced that there is no way but by learning to be meek.

For the goal of Christianity is the attainment of character. It is not the acceptance of a creed. It is not the performance of a correct ceremonial. Orthodoxy, says Canon ROBINSON, may be obtained in a day; the performance of rites and ceremonies may be taught in a week. But Christianity is character. And for the formation of character decades of years, if not centuries, are required. It must, therefore, be quite unreasonable to be disappointed that the Hindus are not all converted yet. It must be very difficult—Canon ROBINSON says impossible—to measure progress by statistics. But the point is that the Hindus will never be converted to Christ until the Englishman in India has learned to be meek as well as to inherit the earth.

There seems to be no way of approaching the Hindu except through character. And that the character of Christian men. He will not be

impressed with the character of Christ, even if he is induced to look at it, so long as the character of Christians belies it. And it is useless for the Christian in India to say that Christ was courageous as they are. No doubt it is His courage, His sympathy, and His strenuous activity that most appeal to Englishmen. But these are just the virtues that do not appeal to Hindus. The Christ who comes to them in the character of an energetic Englishman, even if he be also full of sympathetic interest in their affairs, and undaunted in the face of peril, will not appeal to them. He is not an object of adoration, scarcely even of admiration. They see no beauty in Him that they should desire Him.

The Englishman must learn to be meek and lowly in heart. He must understand that he has appropriated only one-half of the character of Christ. 'We Asiatics,' said a Japanese Christian, 'gave the Europeans their religion; but in giving Christ we lost Him.' But did they lose Him wholly? The meekness and gentleness of Christ —does it not seem as if the East had never given up that part to the West? At any rate, the Hindu is ready to appreciate Christ's gentleness. Until the Englishman appreciates and appropriates it, he will not win the Hindu to Christ.

But if Christianity is character, if it is the mind of Christ, and if the Hindu has half of the mind of Christ already, where is the argument for Christian missions? The argument is intact. Christian missions are as imperative and as urgent as ever. For the meekness of the Hindu is not the meekness of Christ. The Hindu is content with the abstract quality of meekness. He does not believe in personality. He scarcely understands it. He carries his meekness to the length of self-absorption. But it is absorption in the undefined. It is not the meekness of one who, having his own will, takes it and makes it God's. It is not the meekness of one who can say, 'I delight to do thy will, O my God.' The Hindu, after all, has lost Christ wholly. For, though he has retained the qualities of meekness and gentleness, yet they are not the qualities of a man. They are not virtues. And it is necessary that the Hindu should recover the Christ whom he has wholly lost.

But it can only be done by character. There is a story told of an Indian catechist attached to an English missionary society in North India, whose accounts were never right and who was at last dismissed for dishonesty. He spent all the money which was entrusted to him in promoting missionary work, but not exactly in the way in which he was told to spend it. The English superintending missionary demanded monthly accounts and refused to continue the supply of funds until these were forthcoming. Accordingly the poor catechist, who had not kept any proper accounts, filled up the balance-sheet in the way which he thought would please the European missionary, and when he was questioned about some of the items, and they were found to be incorrect, he was dismissed as being unfit for missionary work. Several years later a lady was visiting a distant village in the jungle. She tried to make the simple folk understand what manner of person Jesus of Nazareth was. She told them how He was the poor man's friend, how He used to eat with them and visit their homes, how He used to go about healing wherever there was sickness, how the children used to run after Him in the street and clamber about His knees. Her description seemed to meet with an unusually intelligent response; and, as she finished, some one exclaimed, 'Miss Sahib, we know him well; he has been living here for years!' Amazed, the lady discovered that this old catechist had settled there on his own account. It was he who fetched the old men and women their water and their fuel. Where any one was sick, it was he who used to sit outside the door till evening, and then come in; for no one ever got a chance of sitting up at night but he. When plague and cholera visited the village, he was the intrepid nurse. In the old man unfit for missionary employ the people of that village had seen and recognized Jesus Christ.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Aberdeen.

Part III.

V. In studying the text of Luke, the first question at every point must be what relation exists between his narrative and that of Mark, which was employed by him and to a large extent incorporated in his Gospel. Yet Luke rarely contents himself with merely transcribing Mark. Apart from stylistic improvements, which may be disregarded as adding nothing to the meaning, he often works into passages taken from Mark new statements, which are best explained as obtained from a different authority:[1] in such places he took Mark's narrative as his basis, and treated other narratives, oral or written, as subsidiary. In other places he took a different narrative as his basis. No one doubts that he had access to various accounts of the life of Jesus; he himself says that several older written histories were in existence when he began to compose his biography, and that he had access to even better sources of information than any of those earlier historians. There is no reason to doubt that he often was in possession of more than one authoritative account of an incident; and there need be no hesitation in assuming that he worked up one authority by incorporating in it details taken from another. Can we determine what authorities he used, and how he treated the narrative of Mark in his account of the Last Supper?

That Luke used Mark as his fundamental authority in describing the preparation of the Feast is certain: 22^{7-13} corresponds to Mk 14^{12-16} and to Mt 26^{17-19}. Matthew has shortened Mark, and it would be instructive to observe how the shortening is achieved, *e.g.* the despatch of two disciples to find and prepare the room is omitted; and if we had no other narrative than Matthew's, it would be natural to understand that all the Twelve went for this purpose; yet it is certain (and accepted by almost all scholars) that Matthew had Mark's narrative before him, and there is no reason to think that he intended to dissent from his authority in this one point. It is merely his brevity which lends itself to a misunderstanding. Luke, on the other hand, names the two disciples that were sent, Peter and John,[2] and mentions an order which Jesus gave them, and which elicits from them the question, 'Where wilt thou that we make ready?' Mark and Matthew give this question in a longer form, 'Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the Passover?'[3] This question includes in itself the statement which Luke puts in the initial command of Jesus, 'Go and make ready for us the Passover, that we may eat.'

Luke is at this point fuller and more detailed than Mark; and yet he agrees almost verbally with the latter in the rest of the narrative, vv.$^{7-13}$. It is therefore evident and certain that Luke used Mark as his fundamental authority here, adding from some other source of information the names of the two disciples, making their action stand out more prominently in the incident, and slightly modifying the initial stage. Whether this modification is preferable need not be discussed: Luke thought so. Probably there is much abbreviation in both accounts.

After this Luke abandons Mark, and follows another authority. V.^{14} might indeed be taken as a modified form of Mk 14^{17}; but the words are quite different, and probably come from a different source; and the indication of the coming betrayal, and the denunciation of the betrayer, which Mark and Matthew place at an early stage in the Feast, are postponed by Luke until a later moment, and are described in terms which differ so much that they must rest on some other authority. According to Luke, Judas Iscariot was present at the solemn ceremony in which the Eucharist was instituted. Mark and Matthew, while they do not actually say

[1] The point is discussed at length in the first paper in *Luke the Physician, and other Studies* (*e.g.* p. 44). Some scholars assume that in making such additions to the Marcan original Luke had no other authority, and simply added them in all cases for literary reasons, to give breadth and tone to the scene. With this view I cannot agree.

[2] There seems no reason to doubt that, in making such an addition, Luke had another authority, whether oral or written we need not here ask. The assumption that he stated the names without knowledge is contrary to the whole spirit of his treatment of Mark.

[3] Matthew shortens the question a little.

that Judas had left the room before the ceremony; mention the denunciation as preceding the Bread and the Cup, and thus suggest that Judas was no longer present; for John says that Judas went out immediately after the denunciation (which he describes with slightly varying details).

We must follow Luke here. He is quite clear as to the presence of Judas, and Mark is not quite clear or positive as to his absence. Now there was no probability that any narrator would through error introduce the traitor into the most solemn ceremony of the Church; but there was a natural tendency to forget or ignore his presence there, and this tendency has probably affected Mark.

Comparison with the Fourth Gospel makes the sequence of the events clearer. Judas was denounced and went out before the supper was finished; but Luke and Paul are positive that the Cup was drunk after the supper. We must conclude that the two parts of the rite were separated on that occasion by some considerable interval, during which Judas departed from the room. In the Synoptists this interval is slurred over (except that Luke's expression 'the Cup after the supper' implies it). The Church ritual ignored the interval, and made the second part follow immediately after the first. The narrative of Mark and Matthew, and one of the narratives in Luke, were strongly influenced by the familiar ritual, which (as we have seen) exercised great power over all subsequent writers. The two parts of the rite are therefore closely conjoined by all three; and the denunciation of Judas had to be placed either before or after. Mark puts it before, and Luke puts it after the rite. In actual fact it happened between the eating of the Bread and the drinking of the Cup. The meeting at the Table, therefore (as was natural), lasted a long time; and there was abundant opportunity for the discourse which John records. The Synoptists mention only one or two incidents in the long meeting.

Luke therefore followed at this stage an authority whom he counted better than Mark. Now, in vv.[15. 16], he quotes words of Jesus which seem appropriate to the beginning of the Supper, and which have nothing exactly corresponding to them in the Mark or Matthew: 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you that I will not eat it, until it be completed in the kingdom of God.' What is the meaning of these enigmatic words? It is usual among commentators to understand, 'I will not eat it *after the present occasion*.' While I would not say that this meaning is impossible, I much prefer the simple interpretation advocated by Professor Burkitt in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, p. 569.[1] 'I will not eat this passover,' a plain intimation that the present meal was not the Passover proper. These words dropped out of the memory and the record as the erroneous idea affected Mark that the present meal was the Jewish Passover. Luke has repeated some of Mark's erroneous expressions on this point; but he also preserves clear evidence of the truth, as it appears from John, that this meal took place twenty-four hours before the Passover meal proper.

What, then, is the force of the conjunction 'for'? On the interpretation of the commentators I see no explanation of it. According to our theory there is an ellipse of the kind common before a statement introduced by 'for' (γὰρ): 'I eagerly desired[2] to eat this passover with you before I suffer [but this cannot be], for I will not eat it, until the act be completed in the kingdom of heaven.'

The following two verses ([17. 18]) belong to the same narrative and authority as [15. 16]. They clearly describe the same act as Mk 14[27-29], but are taken from some other Source, as a comparison shows:

Mark 14[23-25].	Luke 22[17. 18].
And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank of it.[1] And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.	And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

The parallel and the differences are patent. Luke has not the words of consecration (Mk 14[28]). Must

[1] In the first draft of this paper, written in 1900, I took this view; and it was largely the hesitation to differ from so many high authorities that led me to postpone publication until I had thought over the matter longer. Professor Harnack, in *Theolog. Ltztg.* 1908, also approves of this interpretation (as Professor A. Souter informs me).

[2] Aorist, not perfect tense: the force of the aorist is not easily caught in English. At some moments one feels that the perfect gives it best, at other moments one sees it best in our past tense, and so on. Yet some too modern scholars think that the tenses were being confused with one another.

we conclude that the Source which he here uses omitted those words? I think not: Luke found them in the Source, but himself omitted them, because they were to come in what seemed to him a more appropriate place in verse.

There follows in vv.[19. 20] a formal narrative of the institution of the Eucharist as a regular ceremony of the Christian society. The narrative corresponds to Mk 14^{22-25}, Mt 26^{26-29} (Mark being the Source, Matthew the reproduction). It is usually assumed by the modern scholars that Luke here followed Mark, and that either he completed his primary authority from some other Source,[1] or his narrative has been supplemented by a later hand, and was originally much shorter than Mark. A comparison of the two accounts, indicating by italics slight differences, due to the character and style of each narrative, and by capitals important differences:

Mark 14^{22-25}.	Luke $22^{19. 20}$.
And *as they were eating*, he took bread, and when he had BLESSED, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body.	And he took bread, and when he had GIVEN THANKS, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body WHICH IS GIVEN FOR YOU: THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.
And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood OF the covenant, which is shed for MANY, etc. (as above.	And the cup *in like manner after supper*,[2] saying, This cup is the NEW covenant IN my blood, even that which is poured out for YOU.

Westcott and Hort, followed by some other recent scholars, regard the words of Luke in v.[19] after 'This is my body,' and the whole of v.[20], as an early interpolation. These words are omitted in the Bezan Codex and a few related manuscripts or versions—*i.e.* the so-called Western text of Luke does not contain them. It is argued that addition is more probable than omission, but this seems a feeble argument, involving a modern point of view, and inharmonious with the ancient way of thinking. Later readers of the history, and modern scholars, have felt eager to gather every item of information about the life of the Saviour; but the ancient view in religious matters rather preferred to avoid anything wrong or inharmonious than to treasure up everything that could be gathered together. Hence the tendency during the earliest period in the transmission of the text was rather towards omission than towards addition.[3] The great crime was unjustifiable addition: silence was safe in religious ritual.

Moreover, there was a strong reason suggesting that omission was needed here. In Luke, vv.[17-18] describe the giving of the cup, and v.[19] the giving of the bread. The giving of the cup a second time in v.[20] seemed wrong; and when it was omitted, there resulted a description of the ceremony in its two stages, in which the cup was first and the bread last. It is certain that this false opinion about the order gained ground in some places, for that is the order mentioned in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a document probably of the second century.[4] The reason why this false opinion spread probably is that it was based on the false interpretation of Luke.

There was also probably a tendency to assimilate the text of the three Evangelists about this ceremony. There was little comparative critical faculty in the ancient Church; and generally in the Gospels there is little trace of attempted assimilation or harmonizing of the narratives; but in the account of this impressive and frequently repeated ceremony there probably did grow up some feeling of the inconsistency between Luke and the other two Gospels.

Through these two causes there came about the omission of v.[20] and the last words of v.[19] (which Mark does not admit). We confidently accept the fuller narrative of Luke, as it is given in all the most important manuscripts, in the overwhelming majority of authorities, and in the received text.

We have, then, in Luke's text two distinct accounts of the Supper, the first incomplete, the second complete. The first was probably cut by Luke, because the second was the most detailed and corresponded best to the actual ceremony as it was celebrated in the churches which he knew. He felt that he must give the second account entire, but from the first he was free to cut out the words which were repeated in the second.

[1] The two stages 7 and 8 are both given; Paul omits 8.

[2] Luke's brief word, 'in like manner,' sums up all the stages, as previously stated, and as given more fully by Mark.

[3] The one marked exception is the Bezan Text of Acts.

[4] As has been pointed out, this order was not thought of or known to Paul, though some have falsely inferred from 1 Co 10 that it was practised by him.

Why, then, did Luke not combine the two accounts, instead of leaving them side by side in his text? The answer is that he did not feel free to work them into one, because he felt bound to leave the second unchanged in its simplicity, corresponding to the ceremony as he knew it; and because he wished to leave each of two revered authorities as it was, without additions.

If the second account was confirmed by the usage of the Church, and Luke felt himself not at liberty to change it in any way, why did he give the first at all? Why not omit it? His reason evidently was that he had this account from an authority which he believed to be absolutely trustworthy, and which he could not disregard, even though it did not agree entirely with the settled form of the Church ceremony. Such high authority could not belong to any one except an eye-witness: either orally or in writing, Luke knew the account given by one of those who had been present 'even as they delivered' it to him, 'which from the beginning were ministers and eye-witnesses of the Word.' If the account was given orally, we should not be able to get any further; but if he found it in a written source, we might proceed to inquire whether this was Q, the lost common Source of Matthew and Luke, which (as I have tried[1] to show) was a narrative contemporary with the events.

The latter supposition seems to me, on the whole, perhaps more probable. There is naturally much reason to suppose that Q would contain the events of this night; the whole burden of proof lies with him who would maintain the negative. One who from day to day set down in writing what he had seen of the life of Christ, and what he had heard from His lips, could hardly be conceived as omitting this incident.

This supposition, then, would require us also to suppose that Q also contained the events of the following day, the Trial and Crucifixion; and I have elsewhere maintained that Q was written before the Death of Christ; but the two positions are not inconsistent. Q was a sort of diary, written from time to time, as the events occurred, and had therefore no thought of the Death of Christ as the culmination and explanation of His life; and yet it concluded with a narrative of the events of that last day. Luke, with Q before him, would be unlikely to omit this part of the document.

[1] In a paper on 'The Oldest Written Gospel' in *Luke the Physician, and other Studies*.

Now these verses suit the character of Q well. They are largely sayings. Narrative plays a very small part in them. The Church ceremony, as it established itself, tended to prevent any fuller narrative being written. As we have seen, Luke did not feel free to add anything to the settled form of words, but sets down that form by itself, and places beside it, but not in it, the additional information which he possessed. Yet that form of words was, undoubtedly, abbreviated from the longer incident as it really occurred. A contemporary writer noted down the fuller words, including both those that were taken into the Church ceremony and others that were omitted in the ceremony. From John we know that far more was said at the Supper than appears in any or all of the other authorities.

This supposition leaves one very serious difficulty: how can it be supposed that Matthew here deserted Q completely and preserved no trace of it? I fully acknowledge the difficulty, and cannot answer it or propose any solution. Many will probably consider that Luke's authority in vv.[15. 16] is not Q, but the account, probably oral, of some other witness; and there is much to be said for that view. I would only urge that there is in men a certain element of individual freedom in choice, and that we cannot always understand why another person will choose just so many things out of a larger number, and leave some which others, and we personally, would value equally or even more. There always remains this incalculable element in the use of historical or literary Sources; and modern investigators do not always allow sufficiently for it, and are resolutely bent on framing a theory which will account for everything without taking this element into the reckoning. Moreover, we must remember that Q differed here from Mark and from the established form of the rite, containing words which were not taken into the Church rite, abbreviated as the rite was. Mark certainly felt it best to be guided greatly by the rite as it was celebrated in his time. Might not Matthew also feel the same? Fortunately, John had no such feeling, and stated very fully his impression of the whole scene and the teaching which was then given, untrammelled by the limitations of the Church rite; and Luke also preferred to mention what he found in a thoroughly good authority.

We must, for the present, leave it quite an open question whether the other authority used by Luke at this point was Q, or a third written Source, or

an oral narrative. My own inclination is towards either the first or the third of these alternatives. His fundamental account in vv.[19. 20] we take to be simply an account of the Church Rite, as it was known to him. We never escape from the overmastering influence of this Rite: it affects every writer in one way or another.

Luke's second account is evidently the one which he regarded as fundamental. The other account was intended as subsidiary, and was mutilated to avoid repeating anything that was given in the fundamental account; and yet it was authoritative to Luke in the highest degree.

We have seen why it was so authoritative to him that he could not pass it by; but there rises another question. If it was so authoritative, why did he make it subsidiary, and mutilate it? and if it was subsidiary, why did he place the subsidiary and incomplete account first, and the fundamental account second? To do that was to obscure the sequence and to invite misapprehension. Such was the result that followed. Luke's narrative has been misunderstood, tampered with, and mutilated repeatedly in subsequent times, because his method was misunderstood. When we place ourselves at the proper point of view, everything becomes quite simple; and we see that the subsidiary account had to come first, because its opening words are introductory to the incident as a whole: they could not possibly be placed after vv.[19. 20]. Mark and Matthew require an introductory phrase to place their narrative of the ceremony in the context, 'And as they were eating, he took bread.' Luke, in his fundamental account, simply says, 'And he took bread,' because the preceding words stated the situation sufficiently. After the ceremony proper Matthew and Mark add a verse, which Luke keeps in the subsidiary account, because it was closely parallel to a sentence in it, which had not been taken into the Church order of the ceremony.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

THE HEAVENLY CITY.

Its Outcasts and its Inhabitants.

Revelation xxi. 27.

'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.'—R.V.

The ideal city which St. John depicts is not heaven, except in so far as heaven is already latent in the earth and shall finally be realized in it. The indications of the path of interpretation are clear. The ideal city is the Holy Jerusalem, and stands in contrast to the great city Babylon. Whether we take them separately, or oppose them to one another, their meaning is obvious. It is certainly not heaven and hell that they represent, but rather the forces and dominions upon earth of good and evil. Jerusalem represents here, as it does in ancient prophecy—upon which the pictures of this book are almost entirely based—the people of God upon earth, in their holy character and their organized force. If there were any doubt of this, the added picture of 'the Bride, the Lamb's wife,' would remove all uncertainty. For, whether we turn to the Old Testament or the New, the metaphor is consistently applied to the covenant people of God. The ideal city, therefore, represents the Church of Christ in its ideal meaning and its ideal attainment. It is not a 'jeweller's shop,' as some have called it in supercilious and ignorant scorn. It is a symbolic picture of the spiritual power and grandeur which God has destined for the earth.[1]

It is the glorified Church that is here spoken of, and hence the text may be said to refer to heaven, for at the present moment the nucleus of the glorified Church is in heaven, and from heaven every defiled thing must be shut out. Hence, too, it may refer to the kingdom of the millennial age, when the saints will reign with Christ upon the earth for a thousand years, when even upon this battlefield our conquering Leader shall be crowned with victory, and where His blood was shed His throne shall be set up, for among the sons of men shall He triumph, even among those that spat in His face. The text may also be read as including the eternal world of future bliss, for of that glorious, endless, undefiled inheritance the

[1] J. Thomas, *The Ideal City*, 4.

Church glorified will be the possessor, but out of her shall long before have been gathered all things that offend, and them that do iniquity.[1]

I.

Its Outcasts.

I. The citizens of the ideal city are defined by moral and spiritual characteristics: 'There shall not enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie.' There is nothing but moral disability that excludes from the citizenship of this city; there is nothing but moral power that can entitle to its privileges. It is not the wise and the prudent, the opulent and the mighty, that have a right to the seats of the blessed in the city of Life. The gates are open only to those that have become again as little children, that have opened their hearts without reserve to the glory of the Father, and have been cleansed from all the impurity of the old life.

1. *Anything unclean.* The reference is to the blemish that detracts from perfect soundness, to the defiling characteristics that distinguish the unclean from the clean, the common from the holy. This moral unsoundness is the elementary fact in the history and progress of sin, and a universal fact in human experience. Whatever controversies may be raised concerning total and partial depravity in the beginning of human life, the universal sweep of moral unsoundness in our race is patent enough to every unprejudiced observer. 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity' may be boldly taken as a generalization, and applied to every member of the human family. The fountain of our mother-humanity from which we all spring is tainted with impurity, and no perfection can issue from it. We are all unclean. The defilement of moral unsoundness is born with us.

In the margin the translation given is—'anything that is common.' A still more accurate, though startling, translation would have been—'anything that is *vulgar*.' But our translators may well have shrunk from using this word, because it would convey to many people a wholly wrong impression. What would have been the conception of heaven in some minds if it had been represented on scriptural authority as a place from which all that is vulgar is shut out: what a society-heaven to those who identify vulgarity with hard hands and workman's clothes! Nevertheless, there stands the word κοινὸν, 'vulgar': and so perplexing did it seem to some of the later transcribers of the Greek Testament MSS, that they altered it into κοινοῦν, 'everything that defileth,' and in this form it appears in our Authorized Version; and we have to ask, What did St. John mean when in his vision of the heavenly city he said that everything *vulgar* should be shut out?

In the vision of St. John the vulgar that is shut out from the city of heaven is not a nation, nor a class, nor a set; it is a character. It is the egotistic element. The vulgar person in any rank, from the nobleman to the labourer, is one whose whole interests centre on himself, who is unconscious of the feelings of others, lacking all the delicate sympathies and sensibilities of the gentler nature. One who pushes and tramples, and not only that, but one who is simply obtuse and callous, has in him the root of vulgarity. And this dulness of perception is met with equally in all ranks. Now this egotism, which we recognize as the root of vulgarity, is precisely what we must lay aside on entering God's presence. He giveth grace to the humble; to follow Christ it is needful to deny or suppress oneself; it is the meek and the modest that alone can realize God's presence. All purse-proud, or intellect-proud, or success-proud characters—in fact, all egotisms are alike condemned by our instinct as vulgar, and by our conscience as incapable of entering into the kingdom of God.[2]

The essence of all vulgarity lies in want of sensation. Simple and innocent vulgarity is merely an untrained and undeveloped bluntness of mind; but in true inbred vulgarity there is a dreadful callousness, which in extremity becomes capable of every sort of bestial habit and crime, without fear, without pleasure, without horror, and without pity. It is in the blunt hand and the dead heart, in the diseased habit, in the hardened conscience, that men become vulgar; they are for ever vulgar precisely in proportion as they are incapable of sympathy,—of quick understanding,—of all that, in deep insistence on the common but most accurate term, may be called the 'tact' or 'touch-faculty' of body and soul: the tact which the Mimosa has in trees, which the pure woman has above all creatures: fineness and fulness of sensation—beyond reason; the guide and sanctifier of reason itself. Reason can but determine what is true; it is the God-given passion of humanity which alone can recognize what God has made good.

This is the chief vulgarity, that of character, the dull unconscious egotism; but there is also a vulgarity of intellect.

[1] C. H. Spurgeon, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 390.

[2] J. M. Wilson, *Sermons Preached in Clifton College Chapel*, 2nd ser., 28.

There are minds which are so absorbed in personalities and trifles as never to rise to human interests in literature or politics, or the life of the home circle; and that without possessing the unlettered and often courteous dignity of the peasant. Ignorance is not vulgarity; the vulgarity lies in a prostitution of education to trivialities, or worse, which pastures on the criminal, or sporting, or society, or other gossip of the day. We feel the incompatability of such a mind with all the higher life. This sort of vulgarity also excludes itself from the heavenly city. It is 'whatsoever things are true . . . honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report'; it is these, and thoughts of these, that fit our minds for the city of the heavens.

And the vulgarity of character and of intellect lead on by a dreadful law to the worst of all its manifestations, which is spoken of as uncleanness. The utter egotism, the want of respect and sympathy for others, the absorption in self-gratification, kept in check by no thought of what is pure and lovely and divine in others or ourselves, finds here its crowning manifestation, and assuredly this blots out, like some dense fumes, the light of the presence of God, and debases the whole nature.[1]

2. *He that maketh an abomination.* The next stage in the development of evil is that of moral offensiveness. Moral 'uncleanness' rapidly becomes moral 'abomination.' In spite of the sinfulness of human nature, sin at a certain stage becomes offensive to the moral sense of the bulk of the people. There is an early point in the career of sin where the personal consciousness of moral obliquity far outweighs its moral offensiveness to others. The external relations of sin have not developed to the point of its becoming an abomination to men, though it is already an abomination to the all-holy God. But the road from 'uncleanness' to 'abomination' is an open way. The sphere is one, and the path is continuous.[2]

You will observe, the seer is not speaking of persons, but of things. One might wonder at first sight why he does not from the outset use the masculine form. Why does he not say, 'There shall in no wise enter into it any *man* that worketh abomination'? In the case of the second clause, the Revised Version has inserted the personal element, '*he* that worketh a lie.' Yet I have no hesitation in saying that in so doing it has weakened, and not strengthened, the original sense. The writer is speaking primarily and mainly, not of actors, but of the influence of their acts. Indeed, it is a great blessing for the human race that it should be so. Personal salvation would be impossible except on the supposition that a man shall be enrolled in the membership of the kingdom while yet he is in a state of uncleanness. This has always been regarded as the pith and marrow of the evangelical doctrine. It is as philosophical as it is orthodox, and it is as comforting as it is philosophical. The man who would enter the kingdom of Christ must, according to St. Paul, enter by faith alone. He must not wait until he is pure. He must be content to come with the *intention* of purity, with the desire to be what he is not. He must be allowed to put his foot on the sacred threshold 'just as he is, without one plea.' He must be accepted for an aspiration. If he would have his name written in the book of life, it must be written there in *advance* of his life. He must be justified before he is sanctified—pronounced fit for the kingdom in the light of days to come. The only hope for him is his permission to survive, his permission to enter within the gates of gold, while yet his own life has not transcended the brass.[3]

3. *He that maketh a lie.* The final stage of evil is the complete perversion of the moral judgment. 'Maketh, or worketh, a lie.' In the twenty-second chapter we find the fuller phrase, 'Loveth and maketh a lie.' Sin, having grown into an abomination, acts upon the inner life of the sinner no less powerfully than it does on the moral sense of the beholders. Its external offensiveness goes hand in hand with internal destructiveness, until the life becomes perverted into fossilized evil, and its every activity becomes a living lie. At last evil is loved as good, and good as evil.[4]

Why does he not say 'telleth a lie'? Why does he keep the impersonal form, as if he were speaking of the working of a machine? It is because he is not thinking of a *spoken* lie. He is thinking of what we call the principle of make-believe. He is contemplating the efforts of men to make the appearance pass for the reality, to give a gloss to circumstances, to cause things to seem what they are not, and not to seem what they are. And he declares that the result of these attempts is ever the same—evanescence. He maintains that nothing which is unreal can be permanent, that no sham can live, that everything false is, by its very nature, doomed to perish.[5]

In Plato's ideal state, while lying on part of the private citizens is condemned, it is allowed to magistrates. As Rendel Harris says, it is a reserved art, practised by the guardians of the community upon the rank and file, presumably for their good. The rulers have reserved rights in untruthfulness. 'The lying,' he continues, 'which Plato inculcated was not of the pitiful degraded kind which Liguori patronizes and which Cardinal Newman was so hard put to it to defend. But whatever was covered by the Platonic doctrine, the Christian Church generally repudiated

[1] J. Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies*, § 28.
[2] J. Thomas, *The Ideal City*, 209.
[3] G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, 327.
[4] J. Thomas, *The Ideal City*, 210.
[5] G. Matheson, *Ibid.* 331.

it, and it is expressly repudiated in the Apocalyptic sketch of the New City.'[1]

A gentleman passing through the railroad train spoke to a lady and her little son.

'How old are you, my little man?' asked the gentleman.

'Ma,' asked the little boy, 'is he a conductor?'

'No,' said the mother.

'Then I am eight,' answered the boy.[2]

II. Why are the unclean, the abominable, and the untruthful outcasts from the city of God? There are three good reasons:

1. It is the decree of God. Shall the serpent leave his horrid trail upon the heavenly Eden, twice made of the Lord? God forbid! The purity of a world twice made, the perfection of the Church of the regenerate, the majesty of the presence of God, all demand that every sinful thing should be excluded. All heaven and heavenly things cry, 'Write the decree and make it sure, there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth.' Grave it as in eternal brass, and let omnipotence go with the decree to execute it with the utmost rigour, for it would be horrible indeed if a second time evil should destroy the work of God. Into the Church of the firstborn above the breath of iniquity must not enter. It cannot be that the work which cost the Redeemer's blood should yet be defiled. The eternal purpose of the Father, and the love of the Spirit, forbid that the Lord's own perfected Church should be invaded by any unholy thing.[3]

2. It is due to the nature of the inhabitants of the city. What is their nature?

1. They are in union with God. When Paul speaks of the Church as the Bride of the Lord Jesus Christ, he emphasizes the mystery of the unity by which the Church becomes, as it were, the other self of the Lord, so that it dwells in the full glow of His love, and receives the gracious fulness of His life. He becomes the head of the Church, and the living fount of all its grace and power. So that the figure of the 'Bride' as conceived in the New Testament is one of loving dependence and living unity. She finds her joy, her fulness, her splendour, her very life, in Him for whom she is adorned. She is a very part of His life, and finds her true glory in losing herself in Him.

2. They live in accordance with the Divine motives and ideals. God's great task is to make the city the Bride of the Lamb, and to adorn her with the graces of her Lord. Imagine for a moment that the decree of our text were reversed or suspended, and that it were allowed that a few unregenerate men and women should enter into the glorified Church of God. Suppose, in addition, that those few should be of the gentler sort of sinners, not those who would profanely blaspheme the name of God, nor openly break the Sabbath, but a few who are indifferent to God's glory, and cold and formal in His praise. How could heaven bear with these? Those who are neither cold nor hot are sickening both to Christ and to His people, and must they endure the nausea of their society?

3. Their life is a mirror of the life of God. How high the destiny, how marvellous the ideal, to fill out the rounded wonder of the life of God, to make music for the heart and love of the Eternal! True, there is a sense in which God is absolute, and requires and can have no complement. But there is another sense in which He completes Himself in His creatures. Why else was the eternal solitude ever broken, and the myriad beauties of the universe poured forth from the infinite life? It must have been because God realized Himself in His creation, and found there complete satisfaction for His love. But it is in the kingdom of love among men that He realizes Himself in the grandest proportions of love. There, among all the wonders of the world, the glory of the Infinite is most perfectly mirrored. Such must the ideal city be.

3. It is due to the nature of the persons excluded. The reason why wicked men cannot be happy is not alone because God will not let rebellion and peace dwell together, but because they will not let themselves be happy. The sea cannot rest because it is the sea, and the sinner cannot be quiet because he is a sinner. If they were admitted into the place called heaven, they would not be partakers of the state of heaven, and it is the state of mind and character which is, after all, the essence of the joy. To be in a heavenly place and not in a heavenly condition would be worse than hell, if worse can be. What are songs to a sad heart? Such would heaven be to an unrenewed mind. The element of glory would destroy rather than bless an unrenewed mind.

[1] J. Rendel Harris, *Sidelights on New Testament Research*, 231.

[2] W. Armstrong, *Five-Minute Sermons to Children*, 99.

[3] C. H. Spurgeon, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 393.

It was about thirty years ago, or more, when stage-coaches still ran, that an excellent old clergyman, who had a keen observation of the world, was travelling on the top of the coach from Norwich to London. It was a cold winter night, and the coachman, as he drove his horses over Newmarket Heath, poured forth such a volley of oaths and foul language as to shock all the passengers. The old clergyman, who was sitting close to him, said nothing, but fixed his piercing blue eyes upon him with a look of extreme wonder and astonishment. At last the coachman became uneasy, and turning round to him said, 'What makes you look at me, sir, in that way?' The clergymen said, still with his eye fixed on him, 'I cannot imagine what you will do in heaven? There are no horses or coaches, or saddles or bridles, or public-houses in heaven. There will be no one to swear at or to whom you can use bad language. I *cannot* think what you will do when you get to heaven.'[1]

A little girl, who knew a great many bad and wicked children, asked, 'Mother, do all children go to heaven when they die?' 'Yes, my daughter,' was the answer. A look of perplexed inquiry came into her eyes as she repeated, '*All* of them?' When her mother again answered, 'Yes,' she drew a deep sigh, and sympathetically whispered, 'Poor Dod!'[2]

II.

Its Inhabitants.

1. Their names are written in a book. To live in a book is one of the deepest desires of men. There are few who have not wished to have an influence on earth extending beyond the range of their earthly life. To have something that will survive me, something that will speak of me when I have gone, something that will make me a power in the world after I have passed away, is an ambition which, in some form or other, has been felt by all. Various have been the forms it has taken. Some have sought it by winning love, some by leaving a mass of money, some by rearing a monument of art, some by bequeathing the creations of music. But even those who would live by art, by sculpture, by music, expect to have their name preserved through the medium of a *book*. It is in no case by our own book that we mainly hope to live. Our ambition is to have our names written in some *other* book, to be quoted as an authority, to be referred to as an illustration. Even to write one's name in a visitors' book has a kind of symbolic pleasure; it suggests the transmission of fame. Even to appear in the fleeting columns of the newspaper gives a glow of satisfaction; it conveys the impression of publicity. But to have the name written in a real book, a living book, a book that *will* live, to appear in pages that are destined to last for centuries, to obtain honourable mention in a record that will endure as long as the language of your country—this is a goal of aspiration which any man might be proud to win.[3]

2. It is the book of life. The 'book of life' is that great volume in which the eternal and inexorable conditions of life are written. It is not, as some have supposed, an arbitrary catalogue of names, selected without a moral basis from the multitudes of men, to which eternal life is attached by an omnipotent *fiat*. Its fundamental character is not more elective than it is moral and spiritual. It is the awful and eternal focus of power out of which the currents of life perennially flow. It is the great God's charter of life based upon God's own nature, upon eternal truth and righteousness. The 'book of life' is the record and forecast of victorious moral grandeur, of the vast achievement of God-given power in the hearts of men. It is the roll of heroes, the volume of the mighty, the record of the pure, the list of the strong sons of God.[4]

Six hundred and thirty years before the probable date of the writing of this 'Book of the Revelation,' Daniel spoke of a book kept by God, and of persons whose names are written therein—'At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, *every one that shall be found written in the book* (Dn 12^{1}). Writing to the Philippians, St. Paul speaks of this book: 'I entreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers, *whose names are in the book of life*' (Phil 4^{3}). And in He 12^{23} he mentions 'the general assembly and church of the firstborn, *which are written* (margin *enrolled*) *in heaven*.' Three times in the Revelation of St. John we read of this book—in Rev 13^{8} 20^{12}, and the present passage.[5]

3. It is the Lamb's Book of Life. The phrase further teaches that the focus of life for fallen humanity is the Lamb. There is only one book of life for men, and that is the 'Lamb's book.' Men, having lost the central fount of power through the fall, must rediscover it in the sacrificial Lamb of the Cross. In the Lamb is now stored all God's power for the salvation of men.

[1] Dean Stanley in *Good Words*, 1861.
[2] W. Armstrong, *Five-Minute Sermons to Children*, 99.
[3] G. Matheson, *Sidelights from Patmos*, 319.
[4] J. Thomas, *The Ideal City*, 212.
[5] A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, xi. 161.

Strange that men are so slow to believe and accept this momentous truth. To-day, as in the days of His flesh, the Son of Man must often say, 'Ye will not come unto Me, that ye may have life.'

It is the Leper Asylum at Bankura—where the stage between the painful pilgrimage and the painless City is passed . . . In the little church a pathetic sight is seen—squatting on the cool concrete floor, groups of men on one side, and women on the other side, are ranged. In front of the entrance the untainted children of the lepers from the Children's House are seated. The dread disease may at any time appear . . . A hymn is given out. How they sang! A strange weird tune, sweet music to the angels bending down to hear the lepers' song of praise. Some lips were swollen and features disfigured. Others hid, under the one white garment, hands and feet from which fingers and toes were rapidly disappearing, or had already vanished. After the hymn every head was bent in prayer, an address was delivered, and then, after another hymn, came the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The missionary took the bread from one to another and slowly and with difficulty in many cases it was eaten, until he came to one bright-faced woman whose hands were mere shapeless pads; she tried to raise the bread but dropped it, and after a fruitless effort to recover it held out the end of her sari and lifted that to her lips. The cup was of course impossible. The minister with a spoon poured the wine into each upturned mouth; then all joined in repeating the beautiful words of the service.

'They which are written in the Lamb's book of life' enter in, leaving the uncleanness this side of that beautiful painless City.[1]

4. Is my name written there? We have just two things to take into account in coming to a conclusion—our past sin and our present holiness.

1. *Our past sin.* There are many who are even now within the Church of God above, and we will ask concerning them, 'Who are these arrayed in white robes, and whence came they?' We receive the reply, 'These are they that have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' 'In the blood of the Lamb!' I feel as if I could sing those words. What joy that there should be anything that can take all my stains away,—all without exception, and make me whiter than snow. If Christ be God, if it be true that He did within that Infant's body contain the fulness of the Deity, and if, being thus God and man, He did take away my sin, and in His own body on the tree did bear it, and suffer its punishment for me, then I can understand how my transgression is forgiven and my sin is covered.[2]

[1] *The Foreign Field*, April 1908, 'The Lepers' Evensong.'

[2] C. H. Spurgeon, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 398.

2. *Our present holiness.* There is still no entrance into the holy city so long as there are any evil tendencies within us. This is the work, this is the difficulty, and since these are to be overcome, how is the work to be done? Simple believing upon Christ brings you justification, but you want more than that; you need sanctification, the purgation of your nature, for have we not seen that until our nature itself is purged the enjoyment of heaven must be impossible? There can be no knowledge of God, no communion with God, no delight in God hereafter, unless all sin is put away and our fallen nature is entirely changed. Can this be done? It can. Faith in Christ tells us of something else beside the blood. There is a Divine Person,—let us bow our heads and worship Him,—the Holy Ghost who proceedeth from the Father, and He it is who renews us in the spirit of our minds. When we believe in Jesus, the Spirit enters into the heart, creating within us a new life; that life struggles and contends against the old life, or rather the old death, and as it struggles it gathers strength and grows; it masters the evil, and puts its foot upon the neck of the tendency to sin.

I read in one of the daily papers the other day of a thrilling incident which took place amid the scene of horror and consternation which followed the collision of the *St. Paul* and the *Gladiator* in the Solent. When the huge American liner crashed into the British warship, two or three seamen on the latter scrambled up the bows of the former into safety. No sooner had one of them done so, however, than he seemed to recollect himself, and called out, 'My God, what have I done? What will my captain say?' and immediately jumped back into the sinking ship.[3]

Some years ago, two soldiers, who were passing through London on their way home, thought that they would like to see Westminster Abbey. But they arrived just as the doors were closing for the night; and were turning disappointedly away, when a kind voice invited them in. It was Dean Stanley, though they did not know him, and he took them all through the glorious building, pointing out its wonders, until at length he stopped before a monument erected in memory of one of England's most famous soldiers. 'Look at that monument,' he said; and, as the men gazed in wonder, he added, 'Now you may never obtain the honour in this world which that general received, and no such monument as his may ever record your heroic deeds, but, friends, *if your names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life*, that will be your best memorial.'[4]

[3] R. J. Campbell, *Thursday Mornings at the City Temple*, 295.

[4] G. Milligan, *Lamps and Pitchers*, 188.

The German Excavations at Jericho.

By Edgar de Knevett, Brussels.

Dr. Sellin has decided to close the excavations conducted by him for three years under the auspices of the German Oriental Society at Tell-es-Sultân, the Old Testament site of Jericho. In the first two years he had already brought to light a considerable part of the outer wall of the Canaanite city, a network of walls and buildings ascribed to a citadel and two distinct groups of houses ranging from the Canaanite to the late Jewish periods. Last year, although he was unable to trace the further course of the outer wall, he ascertained that the so-called citadel was in reality part of an inner wall forming a strong second line of defence to the Canaanite city. He also laid bare a large building to which he is inclined to attribute a very interesting origin. He found the true explanation of the flights of stone steps which lead from the plain to the top of the city mound. The remains in the central part of the city have been further explored and trenches have been dug at various points of the area. Several more inscribed jar handles have turned up. Altogether the results of last year's work add materially to our knowledge of the city destroyed by the invading Israelites and rebuilt or refortified in the reign of Ahab by Hiel the Bethelite.

Even before the appearance of the final memoir, we may gather an idea of the archæological history of Jericho from the three yearly reports of the excavators.[1] Tell-es-Sultân is an isolated rock in the valley of the Jordan, about a mile and a half north of the road which descends from Jerusalem to the fords of the river. The *tell* or 'mound,' oval in shape, measures 1181 feet by 570 feet; its average height is 39 feet above the Ain-es-Sultân, popularly known as Elisha's fountain, which bursts from the base of the eastern slope and flows into the Jordan.

The reports do not make the stratification of the mound particularly clear. Under the Canaanite stratum contemporary with the city walls, in a shaft dug in a trench running from east to west across the greatest width of the *tell*, were found near the inner wall remains of at least four older layers, which carry back the beginnings of Jericho to the third or fourth millennium B.C. No traces of pottery could be discovered in the two earliest, but flint implements proved all the more numerous. In the second stratum from the bottom of the pit, which, curiously enough, was not sunk to the rock surface or the virgin soil, were found three monoliths embedded in a house wall and therefore older than the stratum. One of them showed on its face two cup-shaped depressions connected by a shallow groove, and recalls the much more important Neolithic finds made elsewhere in Palestine, especially in Gezer. Above the Canaanite city lie three or four other layers, the topmost of which belongs to the late Jewish or Hellenistic period. A jump then occurs to the early Byzantine age, of which remains were found over all the surface of the mound, especially along the eastern slope, where in fact the older strata were ruthlessly removed. The Roman or Herodian Jericho, situated a mile or two further south, never included the *tell*.

The chief interest of Jericho lies in its two Canaanite walls. The outer, like the mound, is in the shape of an egg with the point turned toward the south, and the inner resembles an elongated stirrup, or rather a sugar loaf of which the rounded top also points southward. No traces of either exist on the eastern side. According to Dr. Sellin, the missing section of the former wall was destroyed apparently by the Byzantine settlers, and that of the latter, according to the architect Dr. Nöldeke, probably by the Israelites. The uncovering of the outer wall was entrusted to Dr. Langenegger, who marvels at the excellence of its technique; it is certainly a striking proof of the high state of civilization attained by the predecessors of the Israelites. Its circumference, however, was small, as it did not reach $\frac{5}{8}$ths of a mile. The area, which may be estimated at 10 acres, measured 1007 feet in length by 528 feet in

[1] The first report appeared in the *Anzeiger* of the Vienna Academy, 1907, No. xiv, p. 82 sqq., but is more accessible in the almost verbatim reproduction in the *Mitteil. u. Nachrict. des Deutschen Palästina Vereins*, 1907, p. 65 sqq. The two other reports form Nos. 39 and 41 of the *Mitteil. der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*.

breadth, *i.e.* roughly, twice the length and breadth of St. Paul's Cathedral. Yet Jericho compares favourably in size with the other *tells* excavated in Palestine; only Gezer, apparently, is larger. This outer wall circled in a graceful curve the base of the mound, except on the eastern side, where it extended for about 100 feet into the plain to include the spring within its circuit. A brick building at the south-east of the hill, where the wall now ends abruptly, may represent the site of a gate. The wall consists of a foundation of clay and gravel laid on the rock, a stone substructure 6½ feet high or more, bulging outwards and containing one or two rows of enormous blocks, and a stone glacis of about the same height, on which towered a brick wall 6½ feet thick, and from 22 to 26 feet high. To erect the glacis, the Canaanite builders laid down brick gradients which led from the plain to the top of the stone substructure, thus enabling beasts of burden to distribute building materials along the crest of the wall during its construction. The slopes of the hill were deeply cut into to receive the stone base, which thus held back the weight of the earth behind. Similarly kept up at the back of the glacis, which also served as a retaining wall, ran an artificial bank of earth that raised the level of the city near the wall and gave facilities for throwing projectiles from the top of the rampart. On account of its great inclination the breadth of the glacis was reduced at the top to little more than 3 feet, so that the brick wall rested partly on the glacis and partly on the earth embankment. The total height of this cleverly devised bulwark reached inside the city, 20 to 26 feet, and outside, not less than 39 to 49 feet.

The inner wall stood about 100 feet from the outer, and ran more or less parallel to it. It crowned the top of the mound, and apparently did not, like the first, encroach on the plain on its eastern side to comprise the spring within its circumference. The fountain was thus situated between the two walls, and we may suppose that somewhere near it stood the city gates. The water supply of course must have been strongly protected, but the settlers of the Byzantine period unfortunately played havoc with all the buildings in this neighbourhood and no traces of the gates have been found. To judge by the plan, the circuit of this sugar-loaf-shaped wall measured about 1745 feet; the length of the enclosed space is 682 feet, and the breadth only 260 feet. Unlike the outer rampart, this one is double: a small protecting wall still runs round the northern portion at an average distance of 11 feet, and it presumably circled the whole of it. The original height is not given, but the thickness reached 11½ feet, that of the fore-wall being less than half. A kind of scaffolding seems to have been erected in the space between the wall and its fore-wall, perhaps to enable the garrison to hurl projectiles at the enemy. A three-storied castle with seventeen rooms, described in glowing terms in the first report, must apparently be located on or near this wall along its northern face. It should be noted that underneath this second wall was a section of a very strong pre- or proto-Canaanite city wall built of enormous bricks or rather lumps of clay, differently orientated from either of its successors, and presumably contemporary with one of the four older strata referred to above.

The chief Canaanite remains were found in the northern part of the mound, within the inner rampart. A fine curved street divides this quarter into unequal halves, of which one leans against the southern side of the inner wall. Some of the houses have attics resting on its summit, and recall Rahab's house, which, however, stood more probably on the outer wall. The pottery found here belongs to four successive periods, and on the whole shows Mediterranean and Egyptian rather than Babylonian influence.

In their first reports, the excavators seemed to be under the impression that the site of Jericho was deserted between its destruction by the Israelites and its rebuilding by Hiel. This opinion, based on the curse uttered by Joshua against the rebuilder of the city, was hardly supported by the archæological evidence, and it is certainly at variance with the historical data which, on several occasions, represent Jericho as an inhabited site in the three centuries and a half intervening between these events.[1] It is no surprise, therefore, to find that last year's excavations brought to light many remains of the early Israelite period. Even the year before, thirty houses had been discovered which ranged from the eleventh to the eighth century B.C. Terraced

[1] This point is emphasized by Mr. Stanley A. Cook in his searching analysis of the earlier reports of the excavators (*Quart. Stat. Palest. Expl. Fund*, January 1910, p. 63).

on the northern slope of the mound, they face north, are closely packed together, and consist each of one room, rarely with an anteroom or court. The bodies of three infants buried in jars were found below the foundations. The trenches dug last year likewise show that there was an uninterrupted occupation of the *tell* from the Canaanite period.

In early times the hill sloped gently upwards from the plain, but after the Hebrew conquest the ruins of the houses and of the town walls, especially in the north, had considerably raised its level and made its sides much steeper. In order the more easily to carry their building materials to the top of the hill for the purpose of erecting their new city, the Israelites adopted on a large scale the means employed by their Canaanite predecessors for the construction of the outer wall glacis: they built broad flights of stone stairs to connect the level of the plain and the plateau of the mound. These probably existed on all four sides, although only unearthed on three. After the erection of the new city they naturally fell into disuse, and some of the steps formed convenient foundations for later houses. Meanwhile the Israelites undertook a most important piece of work: they levelled the plateau of the *tell*. As no further explanations are given by the excavators, the full meaning of this measure will only be known from the final memoir, but we must remember that the constant piling up of city after city on the same mound tends to give it a conical shape. If new settlers then arrive and wish to build a larger city than their predecessors, they must level the summit of the hill, and even, as in the case of Troy, remove for ever portions of previous towns.

The most important position in Jericho was a hillock on the eastern slope directly overlooking the spring. Remains of a very fine edifice were found here, about 63 feet wide by 100 feet long. It rests on the traces of an earlier 'palace' assigned to the Canaanite period; just under it lay fragments of early Israelite pottery, and at the level of the foundations were vases attributed to the ninth or tenth century B.C. Unfortunately nothing is left but the bare foundations, which show a plan similar to that of the *hilani* of Sindjirli excavated by Dr. von Luschan; but the date of the building (apparently the ninth century B.C.), its privileged position on the mound, and the presumed magnificence of its owner, all lead Dr. Sellin to conecture that this may be none other than the house of the rebuilder of Jericho, of Hiel the Bethelite.

One of the most interesting discoveries is a Jewish village which dates about the eighth century B.C., and stretches north-west from Hiel's residence over the central plateau. Its date is settled by specimems of Cypriote pottery. The houses were in a splendid—in fact in an almost unhoped-for—state of preservation. Merely abandoned, perhaps on account of fire, and not ransacked and destroyed by an enemy, this village, which struck the excavators by its miserably poor appearance, consists, so far as it has been excavated, of two narrow lanes bordered by small houses whose walls still rise to 7 eet, and are, as usual, of inordinate thickness. It contained curious granaries, jar buried infants under some of the foundations, and a large number of household articles. One house in particular consisted of an open court with a bench on the east, a long room on the south, and in an angle of the yard a kitchen where yet stood in a corner the clay receptacle for water. The inventory is complete: plates and dishes, jars and vases, jugs and flasks, corn grinders of red sandstone, lamps, torch carriers, and tools made of iron and staghorn. But the mean aspect of this village strikingly contrasts with the superb construction attributed to Hiel.

The post-exilic remains occur chiefly on the northern slope of the *tell*, between the two town walls. They have yielded *inter alia* terra-cottas in the shape of the human head or of animals, Rhodian jar handles, and infant jar burials under several of the houses. The jar deposits—evidently foundation sacrifices—are particularly instructive for the history of popular religious practices after the Exile, as they had not been proved hitherto for this late period, although it had been strongly suspected that a similar infant burial had been unearthed in the eighth city of Lachish (*c.* 400–330 B.C.). But the most interesting finds were fourteen jar handles stamped with the name of Jehovah in Aramaic characters. Four show the reading *Yah*, יה; the rest have *Yaho*, יהו, as in the Aramaic papyri of Elephantine. They date from the fifth to the third century B.C. Pre-exilic jar handles had been unearthed in plenty in various sites, including Jericho, impressed with a winged symbol and with the legends—'to the king: Hebron'; 'to the king: Ziph,' etc. According to a very plausible explanation, the jars thus stamped

were intended to hold the taxes in kind, such as grain, deliverable to the reigning monarch in Jerusalem. Dr. Sellin adopts Father Vincent's suggestion, that as the taxes in post-exilic times were paid into the temple for the benefit of the restored community's real King, Jehovah, the divine name was in consequence substituted on the jars for the mention of the pre-exilic sovereign.[1]

The second report mentions that near the outer wall, on the north-east of the mound, a jar handle was picked up quite intact and bearing the letters מצה stamped in Aramaic characters. Dr. Sellin hesitatingly suggests the meaning *suck*, *drink*, but it seems difficult to suppose that such an obvious term would be officially impressed on a jar. One could understand it more easily of a graffito such as להסך, *ad libandum*, scratched on the neck of a jar, or בלע, *swallow*, scribbled on a plate, both of which were found in Lachish. On the other hand, it can hardly be the name of the potter or of the owner, as we should expect the usual addition of the patronymic. Possibly we may see here the name of a town. It may be noted that Mr. Macalister has picked up in Gezer a handle bearing the name of the town Memshath and the winged symbol, but without למלך.[2] In a later period, especially after the Exile, we may expect the disappearance of the winged symbol, so that the handle would bear nothing but the mention of the town; nor is there any reason to suppose that this town must necessarily be Hebron, Socoh, Ziph, or Memshath, the only four already known. If so, Mozah, an unknown locality mentioned only in Jos 18^{26}, and belonging, like Jericho, to the tribe of Benjamin, may be suggested as the reading of the מצה handle.

Although perhaps no great surprises, such as a high place or inscribed tablets, have come to light, the excavation of Jericho will prove a great gain to the science of Palestinian archæology, still in its early infancy.

[1] *Revue Biblique*, 1909, p. 277.

[2] *Quart. Stat. Palest. Expl. Fund*, 1908, p. 281.

The American Sermon.

I.

The Methodist Sermon.

It is probable that the Methodist preacher of America who is best known in Britain is the Rev. Louis Albert Banks, D.D. And it is possible that he is the least worth knowing. For Dr. Banks, with all his popularity, is not a preacher. He is a teller of stories. And sometimes the stories are good, and sometimes they are not good. Sometimes they are to the point, and sometimes to some other point. But, however good it is, and however pointed, a story is not a sermon; much less an accumulation of stories.

And yet, curiously enough, 'anecdotage,' that disrespectful epithet suggesting mental decrepitude, is not the word to apply to the sermons of Dr. Banks. He uses his anecdotes bravely, boldly, heroically. With all their multitude and with all their mush, his audience does not grow wearied of them. And that is simply because the anecdotes are not introduced into a Bible text or into a Bible situation; the text and the situation are introduced into the society of the anecdotes. The Bible is brought down to the days of Dr. Louis Albert Banks; to the people among whom he ministers, to the church in which he preaches. And the people go to church to hear a good talk about religious things well spiced with anecdote. And they feel that it is better for them than if they had gone to hear a good talk about the politics of the day or the fashions of the hour.

Dr. Banks has published more than ten volumes of sermons—amongst the rest, *The Great Portraits of the Bible*, *The Great Saints of the Bible*, and *The Great Sinners of the Bible*—and most of his volumes may be had for a dollar and a half from Messrs. Eaton & Mains in New York.

After Dr. Banks for fecundity comes the Rev. George Clarke Peck. But he probably comes a good way after; for we have seen but four volumes of his sermons. Their titles are *Old Sins in New Clothes*, *Vision and Task*, *Ringing Questions*, and *Bible Tragedies*, each of which may be had from Messrs. Eaton & Mains as before (75 cents net).

The most striking characteristic of Mr. Peck's

sermons is the characteristic that strikes one first. It is the surpassing happiness of their titles. Dr. Banks tries to give his sermons a title too, but he is an apprentice compared with Mr. Peck. Dr. Banks calls his sermon on Gn 24^{63} ('He lifted up his eyes, and saw, and, behold, the camels were coming'), 'The Fulfilment of Love's Dreams.' He calls his sermon on the defeat of Goliath, 'The Shepherd who whipped Champion Brute.' With these clumsy efforts compare Mr. Peck's—'The Freedom of the Full-Grown' (the text is Rev 2^{7}, 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life'); or 'The Passing of Mystery' (Jn 12^{29}, 'The people therefore, that stood by, and heard it, said that it thundered'); or 'The Thorn as an Asset' (He 11^{34}, 'Out of weakness were made strong').

Another characteristic of Mr. Peck is that he runs a series. And it *is* a series—each sermon enjoying all the freedom of independence, if you like, and yet each sermon contributing to the worth of its fellows.

Mr. Peck has a third gift. He can lay his hands on the very verse of poetry that he wants at the moment. And it is a verse that can be understood at once; for he knows that his hearers will not have the chance of digging out its meaning by repeated readings.

There is a recent volume of sermons by the Rev. F. B. Stockdale, with the title of *The Divine Opportunity* (Eaton & Mains; 50 cents net). Mr. Stockdale also has his characteristic, and it is the characteristic that we have been looking for in a Methodist. He is a man with a message. He is a man with *the* message. For no Methodist will allow that there is more than one message. And he selects great texts to carry it—'God is love'; 'Father, I have sinned.'

But the God of grace is also the God of all comfort. And that is actually one of the texts taken by the Rev. John Rhey Thompson in his volume on *Burden Bearing* (75 cents net). The echoes of that text are heard throughout the whole volume. Its last two sermons are on the Power of the Holy Ghost, and the Condition of the Beatific Vision.

The *Drew Sermons on the Golden Texts for 1910* ($1 net) are edited by the Professor of Practical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. The fifty-two sermons are written by fifty-two different men. Here, therefore, is a volume which reveals the strength of the Methodist Pulpit of America. Who are the sermons for? Not for children. They are too long for children's sermons, and too long-worded; too theological also, and too abstract. Probably the Sunday School Superintendent is expected to read them before he makes his address on the Golden Text; and it is right that he should be compelled to pass them through his own soul and utter them in suitable language.

But the Methodists of America know how to preach to children. Let us name three volumes of children's sermons that have come into our hands. *Thoughts for the King's Children*, by the Rev. A. Percival Hodgson, contains sermons which in delivery may vary from two to ten minutes. They occupy half a page, or they occupy nine pages. It depends on the subject. For they are studies of their texts. If they were sermons for adults, the old church-going grumbler would call them mere morality. But from first to last, whatever their topic, even when it is punctuality, they have a foundation of fact to rest upon, the fact that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.

The Rev. William Armstrong cuts his sermons, not according to the text, but entirely according to the time, and calls his book *Five-Minute Sermons to Children* (75 cents net).

Are children's sermons published that children may read them, or that preachers may preach them? If children will listen to them, why should they not read them? They will read Dr. D. A. Jordan's *Sunday Talks on Nature Topics* (57 cents net). For they are children's sermons, turning upon the everyday things they delight in, and occasionally aiding the eye with an illustration.

II.

The Universalist Sermon.

The Universalist Sermon is found, when published, at the Universalist Publishing House in Boston, Mass. There inquiry may be made for the following five volumes, which are all typical of Universalism and all worthy of publication as sermons:—*Soul and Body*, by the Rev. Frank Oliver Hall, D.D.; *Justice and Mercy*, by the Rev. Marion D. Shutter, D.D.; *The Leisure of God*, by the Rev. John Coleman Adams; *The College and the Higher Life*, by President Elmer Hewitt Capen; and *Good Tidings*, compiled by the Rev. Q. H. Shinn, D.D.

The last is to be taken first because it is the Universalist manifesto, and contains the Universalist creed. The editor has brought into one volume nine sermons by nine representative Universalist preachers, including himself, and he has finished it off, finished off his volume and his manifesto, by publishing a few short letters written by Mrs. Mary T. Goddard.

The clearest statement of the Universalist creed is by the editor himself. It consists of six propositions: (1) All the laws of nature are God's laws. This is Tennyson's 'That nothing walks with aimless feet.' (2) Man, made in the image of God, is indestructible. In other words—in Dr. Shinn's own words and italics—'Every soul is worth saving, and *will be saved*.' (3) The Bible has to be interpreted 'spiritually.' And so 'eternal' or 'everlasting' is 'age-long.' (4) God is perfect. This means unlimited. Calvinism limits His goodness; Arminianism limits His power. (5) 'We do not believe in the Deity of Christ, but in his divinity'—notice the large letters and the small. (6) 'The doctrine of endless brutality, politely called eternal punishment, is abhorrent.'

The danger of a Church which takes to itself a name like Unitarian or Universalist is to protest too much. Dr. Shutter's volume is a protest from beginning to end. One of the sermons is on the Unpardonable Sin, which Dr. Shutter says is the last refuge of those who cling to the old theology on the subject of destiny. In this fortress, he says, they make their final stand. How does he capture the fortress? He goes with Farrar, all the way that Farrar goes. But he goes further. For Farrar will not admit that there is a reference to the life to come, although the words are 'neither in this age nor in that which is to come.' Dr. Shutter falls back on the character of God. He says, 'God has not made provision for His own defeat.'

Even in Mr. Adams's volume on *The Leisure of God* there is a taste of the apologist. But now the Universalist faith is carried out to its great ends; and in President Capen there is no sensation of protesting left. The sermons were delivered to the students of Tufts College. They deal with life—its promise, its hourly risk, its responsibility. Yes, its responsibility. For it is evident that the Universalist faith in good hands is no encouragement to any man to dwell after the manner of the Zidonians, quiet and secure.

Dr. Hall's attractive little book, *Soul and Body*, brings out the curious result that a Universalist comes at last to be occupied with this world, although Universalism is something that has to do with the next. 'One's chief ambition in life should be to become a strong soul. Everything else is of secondary consideration.'

III.

The Baptist Sermon.

A volume was published a few years ago with the title of *The Southern Baptist Pulpit*, and with this dedication: 'To the Baptists of America, a people who love an open Bible and a pure Gospel.' In that dedication, then, we have the characteristic of the American Baptist sermon. It is a little indefinite. But this very volume gives us the opportunity of discovering what is meant by an open Bible and a pure gospel. It is a volume of three-and-thirty sermons by three-and-thirty Baptist preachers. A few of the names are familiar. Dr. G. B. Eager did some work in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. So also did Dr. E. Y. Mullins, the President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. It is evident that the men have been carefully chosen. And the sermons are worthy of the men. Vague as the phrases of the dedication may be, there is the utmost directness in the sermons, both in the theology and in the ethics of them. The Rev. J. B. Cranfill calls his sermon *A Man in Hell*. It is the rich man of the parable. And when Dr. B. H. Carroll comes to interpret the words He shall separate them one from another, 'Mark the word *separate*,' he says; 'right and left! Right and left! Divide, open ranks. You stand there, and you there. Father here, mother over yonder. Daughter there, son here; brothers, one of you here, the other there. Right and left. Divide! Divide! Separate! That will take the light of hope out of the hearts of all evil men. Oh! there will be weeping at the judgment-seat of Christ! There yawns the impassable chasm. No bridge can span it. No wing can fly across it. Separate! Separate! Separate! Good-bye for ever!'

As unmistakable is the ethics. But morality has no recognition as a thing by itself. The only appeal to right living is the appeal to conscience, the appeal to make peace with God, that right living may follow; the appeal also to what will

happen, not in this life, but in the life that is to come, if peace with God is *not* made.

Dr. B. H. Carroll has a separate volume, with the simple title of *Sermons*. It deepens the impression that the Baptist preacher of the South is almost wholly other-worldly. Everything here is seen and done in the presence of the hereafter. The theology is to a large extent an eschatology.

Perhaps the Baptist preacher who is best known in this country is the Rev. R. S. MacArthur, Minister of Calvary Baptist Church, New York. And it certainly cannot be said that Mr. MacArthur is altogether occupied with the prospects of the life to come. For he has gained a name that is above most names as a social reformer, and is justly regarded with the reverence due to a moral hero. Yet Mr. MacArthur takes nothing away from the Baptist testimony. His moral energy is the energy of a religious life, of a life hid with Christ in God. He is enthusiastic for righteousness because he believes that there shall in no wise enter into the City of God anything that defileth. His most characteristic books are two volumes entitled *Quick Truths in Quaint Texts*.

All these volumes are issued by the American Baptist Publication Society in Philadelphia.

IV.

The Roman Catholic Sermon.

The Roman Catholic sermon is not the same in America as it is anywhere else. If in Rome we must do as the Romans do, the Romans are ready to exchange the compliment. Out of Rome they will do as we do. America is the land of no privilege, and Cardinal Gibbons preaches toleration as the first goodness and the last grace.

Cardinal Gibbons has published a volume of *Discourses and Sermons on Various Subjects* (John Murphy Company, Baltimore). There is not an uncharitable word in it. A little steam is let off once about the Pharisees. But the Pharisees are a safe excommunication to all sorts and conditions of Christians. Cardinal Gibbons recalls with pride the fact that Maryland was founded by Catholics, and that 'this colony was the first to establish the blessings of civil and religious liberty on American soil.'

Three volumes, published at the office of the Catholic World in New York, are in our hands. One is a compact little book of *Sermons for the Ecclesiastical Year*, by the Very Rev. George Deshon, C.S.P. One is a volume of *Five-Minute Sermons*, by the Paulist Fathers. The third is the work of a preacher with distinct preaching gifts, the Rev. Francis A. Baker, also one of the Paulist Fathers. Its title is simply *Sermons*. Now all these books are alike in this, that of their authors no one could speak as Cardinal Gibbons speaks of the Pharisees. In the volume by the Paulist Fathers there is a sermon on Christian Education. The question supposed to be before the parent is, What school shall I send my child to? The first thing to make sure of, say the Fathers, is that the school really gives an education that is worth the name. The next thing is that the school should train the child in virtue as well as in knowledge. And so the best school is a Christian school. But the question, you observe, is an open one. And the word Catholic is not once used.

V.

The Presbyterian Sermon.

The easiest way of gaining an acquaintance with the Presbyterian sermon is to order a set of the 'Presbyterian Pulpit.' There are ten volumes in the set, and they may be ordered from the Presbyterian Board of Publication in Philadelphia at fifty cents each, with five cents for postage; or altogether in a box for four dollars. Each volume has first of all a portrait of its author. There are preachers whose portraits spoil one's appetite for the sermon. But the portraits here are of strong men.

They are strong men, and their sermons are powerful Calvinistic sermons.

There is not a children's sermon in the set; and there is not a sentence applicable to those who are still babes in the things of Christ.

They are theological. At last we reach the great doctrines, grandly held, and unfalteringly declared. Did you say that it was comfort you needed, being harassed by the worries of the week? Did you say that it was direction how to choose your steps amid the manifold temptations that abound? You will find consolation, and you will find guidance, in the doctrine of the Atonement, in Justification by Faith, in the Gift of the Holy Spirit. But you must extract it for yourself. None of these strong preachers will become a judge or a divider over

you. If your meaning is that you must find some one to lean upon, you must go to another race of preachers.

The sermons vary. They vary in length. The President of Hamilton College, Dr. M. Woolsey Stryker occupies an average of fourteen pages for each sermon; Professor B. B. Warfield of Princeton Seminary occupies an average of thirty-two pages. They vary in other ways. But this is their characteristic. Every Presbyterian preacher in America believes that the gospel is contained in its doctrines of grace.

But the 'Presbyterian Pulpit' does not include all the sermon volumes that are published at the Westminster Press or by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

There is a sermon peculiar to America called the 'College Sermon.' It is peculiar at least as a regular institution. And there seems to be a tacit understanding that the uniqueness of the College Sermon shall be sustained by its quality. A few volumes of College Sermons have reached this country. Has any one noticed the *College Sermons* (that is the title) of Charles Carroll Albertson? Their particular possession is respect for conscience. How great is this gift of God to a man about to graduate—a conscience, to warn, to guide, to be outraged, to be honoured. With this weapon in his hand, a man's own conscience, Mr. Albertson gives the student glimpses of the unseen, and a desire for the ordinarily unattainable.

Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson has had a hearing in Britain, but his little book called *Nature, the Mirror of Grace*, is not well known yet. It is written for the purpose of bringing the student of science into the Kingdom.

Then there is a new *Study of the Lord's Prayer*, by the Rev. W. R. Richards of New York. It is such a study as we may turn to for refreshing if we are tired of the vain repetitions of our own English expositors on this well-worked portion of Scripture exposition. In the last sermon Mr. Richards notices that whereas we are taught to pray in the name of Jesus, that name does not once occur in the Lord's Prayer. So we are led on to the saying, 'Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name,' and to consider if we were expected to use the Lord's Prayer as we use it.

If there is an exception to the rule of the Presbyterian sermon it will be found in a large volume published in Richmond, Virginia, and entitled simply *Sermons*. The author is the Rev. William G. Neville, D.D., LL.D. Here are all the ordinary ethical standards and all the ordinary moral appeals. Here is a sermon on 'The Duty of Living in the Present.' And here is the claim of Foreign Missions urged impressively.

But the survey of the Presbyterian sermon must end as it began. In all the list we have looked at there is no more sweepingly theological volume than the *Sermons* of the Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D.D., of the Synod of Virginia. They are nearly as long as Dr. Warfield's, and their titles are unmistakable—the uses of Holy Scripture (seven sermons on end), Sin (five sermons), Repentance, Justification, Substitution, Miracle (three sermons), and the Supernatural (two).

VI.

The Episcopal Sermon.

Many Methodist sermons and all Roman Catholic are Episcopal. But this title may stand. It refers to those books which are published by that very enterprising firm called the Young Churchman Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Two volumes of them are written for lay readers. They expound the Gospel Lessons throughout the year. And just because they are written for laymen, together with the fact that their authors are Churchmen representative of the whole Church, these two volumes give us an incomparable opportunity of discovering the quality of the Anglican Pulpit in America.

Now, with all allowance for individuality, and no preacher worth the name altogether loses his individuality in his Church, there is one passage of Scripture that keeps repeating itself at the reading of sermon after sermon: 'Every creature of God is good if it be received with thanksgiving.' For here is creed and life; and the creed is comprehensive and the life inclusive. There is a sermon on Justification by Faith, and a sermon on Amusements. There is a sermon on the Virgin Mary, and a sermon on the Day of Judgment. There is a sermon on the Unpardonable Sin, and a sermon on Brotherly Love.

With so great a range, is it not to be feared that the impression will be weak? The impression is not made by the preaching. It is made by the Sacraments. The Presbyterian Catechism says: 'The spirit of God maketh the reading and especially the preaching of the Word an effectual

means unto Salvation.' These ministers of the Word say: 'The spirit of God maketh the preaching but especially the Sacraments effectual.' The pulpit is there, but it is not first, and it can afford to be comprehensive.

Yet there are sermons both strong and long. Decidedly so in two volumes now to be introduced. The one is entitled *The Hunger of the Heart for Faith.* Its author is Chaplain Charles C. Pierce, D.D. The other is a volume of *Twenty-four Sermons from St. Ignatius' Pulpit*, by the Rev. Arthur Ritchie. Mr. Ritchie is much occupied with the person and work of our Lord, and he cannot fail of strength and length. Dr. Pierce, as becomes a chaplain, is more occupied with virtues and vices. His grandeur as a preacher comes out of his sympathy with men of strong passions. We have certainly never before read sermons to soldiers that were better worth reading. Think of an open-air service to military men, and the subject of the sermon 'The Assurance of Salvation.'

There is a little book published by the J. B. Lippincott Company of Philadelphia which should find a place here. It is a well-packed volume of *Thoughts on the Services*, by the late Dr. Cleveland Coxe, Bishop of Western New York. The Thoughts are intended to introduce the Liturgy, and to aid in its devout use. There is accordingly the combination of history and exhortation—some history of each occasion and office, and some exhortation to its use for edification.

VII.

The Jewish Sermon.

In the attempt that is here made to distinguish one pulpit in America from another, and to declare the characteristic message of each, it has been a great advantage that we have so often been able to lay our hands upon a representative volume of sermons. In the case of the Jewish Pulpit we have two such volumes. The older of the two goes by the name of *The American Jewish Pulpit*, and it is further described as a collection of sermons by the most eminent American Rabbis. The more recent volume is simply called *Sermons by American Rabbis.* The names in both volumes are many of them quite familiar. This is not simply because the Jew is cosmopolitan. It is due to the fact that so many of the Rabbis succeed in taking their place in the ranks of Old Testament scholarship.

It is no surprise, therefore, to find that both these volumes are Hebrew rather than Jewish, if the distinction may be allowed. They are often such studies of an Old Testament text as any Christian preacher might make if he had the scholarship; they are not often expositions of any peculiarly Jewish doctrine or practice.

There is, for example, a fine exegetical sermon in the older volume by Professor Abraham De Sola, LL.D., Minister of the Portuguese Congregation in Montreal, on Ex 6^9. The words of the Authorized Version are, 'And Moses spake so unto the children of Israel: but they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit and for cruel bondage.' That is also the translation of the Revised Version, and Rabbi De Sola does not greatly alter it. But he says that the word 'so' should be translated 'truly.' It is the same word, though in the plural, as the brethren of Joseph use when they assure him that they are *Kaynim*, 'true men.'

Both volumes are issued by the Bloch Publishing Company of New York. The same publishers have issued the first volume of 'The Free Synagogue Pulpit,' consisting of sermons and addresses by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. Do you know what the Free Synagogue is? It is a protest against the modern teaching of the Synagogue, and yet more against its modern practice; and it is a protest that looks extremely like a disruption. First of all, there are to be no seat rents. But that is a small matter. More important, the Jewish Sabbath is to be done away with. And then the Jewish Pulpit is to be free to proclaim this Jewish religion of progress. Yet Rabbi Wise is determined that the progressive Jew shall not become a Unitarian or any other kind of Christian. This is what his message is to be—'Not the race redeemed by the death of one, but the race self-redeemed by the life of all.'

The first volume of 'The Free Synagogue Pulpit' was issued in the end of 1908. The second volume is to be issued in numbers at 10 cents each. The first number appeared in January 1910.

VIII.

The Congregational Sermon, and Others.

Now let us complete this survey with a glance at a number of books in the order of the House

that publishes them. They are mostly, we think, Congregational. But the Congregational Pulpit is more difficult to characterize than any other. There is so much individuality in it, and it is such an outspoken individuality. It is enough to say that from the Congregational Pulpit we receive some of the best sermons that cross the Atlantic. Messrs. Fleming H. Revell deserve the honour of first mention here. Through their office at 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh, they have done more than any other firm to enrich this country with the wealth of the American pulpit. Their books are noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES nearly every month, but some six or seven await an introduction now.

One of the volumes is the work of an evangelist, Mr. M. B. Williams. He finds his hearers struggling with critical questions. He is struggling somewhat himself. And no wonder, when his guides range from Principal Waller to Professor Cheyne. He settles these things as he can. But he does not make his own soul or his hearers wait till they are settled. He knows quite well that the gospel of the grace of God is independent of this or that book's date.

The Rev. William George Jordan, says the publisher, talks straight from the shoulder. We have seen some of his straight from the shoulder talks. The new volume is *The Crown of Individuality*. It is a book for those whose faces are set, not towards Jerusalem and the end, but towards the battle and the revel of life. 'Work out your own salvation,' he says. And he almost forgets to add 'with fear and trembling.'

And now we come to three men who are undoubtedly of the very elect—Dr. David J. Burrell, Dr. Frank W. Gunsaulus, and Dr. James G. K. McClure. Dr. Burrell's latest is a volume of sermons on *The Wayfarers of the Bible*—sermons on those persons and peoples who had journeys to make, and made them. In one of these journeys 'an inquisitive woman goes a long way to test the wisdom of a foolish wise man.' There is one lesson for all travellers. It is this:

> So on I go, not knowing,
> I would not if I might;
> I'd rather walk in the dark with God
> Than walk alone in the light;
> I'd rather go by faith with Him
> Than go alone by sight.

The volume by Dr. Gunsaulus is *Paths to the City of God*. It is the fellow of *Paths to Power*. The City of God is described in the first four sermons. After that the subjects are miscellaneous. Dr. Gunsaulus is one of the few men who can use poetry in their sermons, and, of course, he uses it sparingly. He has sufficient confidence, however, to quote the poetry of George Meredith. There is a sermon on the Angel standing in the Sun, worth many volumes of sermons.

Dr. McClure won his place in this country by his volume on *The Supreme Things*. The new volume was not delivered at all the Universities in America, but it is remarkably like that volume which was so delivered. Dr. McClure knows where his great strength lies, and does not mean to be shorn of it. This volume is all about living for the best. The book is like the temple, one court leading into another and yet an essential part of the whole.

The other two books are volumes of illustration—*Electricity and its Similitudes*, by Dr. C. H. Tyndall, and a collection of *One Thousand and One Thoughts from my Library*, by Mr. D. L. Moody. The Thoughts are arranged in the order of the chapters and verses of the Bible.

Three beautiful books are published by Messrs. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. of New York. The most beautiful is a series of sermons to children, as it ought to be. It is called *My Father's Business*. Its illustrations are soft and restful reproductions of good pictures. Half of the volume is an exposition of Christ's visit to the Temple. One of the duties inculcated on the children is the duty of asking questions. The text is 'Hearing them and asking them questions.' It is a duty which some children find by no means difficult to fulfil.

The next volume is addressed to young men. It is called *The Young Man's Affairs*. Mr. Charles Reynolds Brown talks to the young man about his main purpose in life, his intimates, his books, his money, his recreation, his wife, and his Church. It is one of those sermon-essay volumes that have lately been so much in favour.

The third book is addressed to those that are full grown. It is an attempt made by Dr. T. Calvin M'Clelland to answer the question, What did Jesus believe? its title being *The Mind of Christ*. Its topics are Jesus' idea of God, Jesus' idea of Himself, of man, of religion, of sin, of salvation,

prayer, and immortality. It is a faithful exposition with incessant application.

But in beauty of book production, the American Tract Society will not give place to any firm. Dr. Louis Albert Banks has many books and many publishers. But nowhere else is he so attractive to handle, and nowhere else is there such a speaking portrait. The binding has not obscured his identity. The illustrations are many, and they sometimes run over a page or two, the conversations being given at length. Are these conversations verbatim reports, or has Dr. Banks a hand in them, as Thucydides had a hand in his? One of the sermons is a study of Browning's 'Saul,' a simple effective study, and Browning seems none put out to be found in the company of 'the saintly M'Cheyne,' or the 'man who was for a long time shut up in Libby Prison.' The name of the book is *The King's Stewards*.

The American Tract Society are the publishers of the greater number of Dr. Burrell's books. And now they have published a very interesting volume, which contains complete services to be read in churches which are temporarily pastorless. Here are the prayers, the hymns, and the sermon. It will be a temptation to some pastors who have churches. This book also is attractively bound, and contains a good portrait of Dr. Burrell. Its title is *The Cloister Book* ($1).

The third author whose sermons the American Tract Society has issued is a stranger. The Rev. Samuel H. Virgin, D.D., LL.D., is Pastor Emeritus of the Pilgrim Church of New York. His sermons —the title of the volume is *Spiritual Sanity*—have a strong evangelical flavour. Manifestly Dr. Virgin has never taken the sermon to be an end in itself, but only a channel of blessing. The blessing is to be found in the printed sermon, as well as in the spoken word.

Although the American Pulpit is, like the magistrate, mainly for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well; although it feels that its insistence must be chiefly on conduct; yet, as we have already seen, there is not wanting in it the preaching of repentance unto the remission of sins, and such are the sermons published by the Standard Publishing Company of Cincinnati, Ohio. One volume, called *Sermons delivered in Louisville, Kentucky*, comes from the Rev. J. W. McGarvey, Professor of Sacred History in the College of the Bible, Lexington. Professor McGarvey has published the volume that he may leave some memorial of himself when he passes. But he has 'no partiality for volumes of sermons,' and has 'derived from them comparatively little benefit.' He believes in the spoken word, in the direct message delivered directly to the upturned faces of the audience. And it is always and only a message of 'Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation.' Not revival sermons exactly. For there is nothing of the emotion of the swaying multitude discernible. But evangelistic sermons, insisting on conversion.

And the sermons of the Rev. W. Henry Book, described as *The Columbus Tabernacle Sermons*, are similar, with perhaps less theology and more anecdote. They were never written down, but were, we are told, 'stenographically reported by Walter C. Galbraith, 1909.'

The Rev. John L. Brandt, LL.D., however, deliberately calls his volume a volume of revival sermons, and gives it the title of *Soul Saving*. The first text is, 'He that winneth souls is wise.' And Dr. Brandt bends his whole being to attain to that wisdom. The sermons have more in them than many sermons with more pretension, but they have nothing in them that is not directed to the one definite end of soul saving.

And now, when just at the end, we come upon a wholly new manner of preaching, a wholly new type of sermon. It is always lawful for a man to preach without a text. It is always lawful to take a text from Shakespeare or Tennyson or even Horace Mann. This the Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones does throughout his volume on *Love and Loyalty*. And not only does he take his text from some extra-Biblical source, but he also builds his whole sermon on extra-Biblical literature, and usually on the very source from which he takes his text. The third sermon is 'An Appeal to Youth.' Its text is taken from Browning's 'Rabbi ben Ezra':

> Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life, for which the first was made.

And then the sermon is an exposition of the poem, with occasional illustration from some other poem. Here is freshness, daring, much point and illustration, a whole volume of pleasant reading. The

book is published at the University of Chicago Press.

Now go back again. The Rev. Frederic E. Dewhurst in *The Investment of Truth*, from the same press, takes his texts from the Bible and expounds them. There is no volume in all the list that goes deeper into the heart of God than this, the volume of a student, but not of a student apart.

The strength of the Rev. J. Sparhawk Jones, Minister of Calvary Church, Philadelphia, in his volume entitled *The Invisible Things*, published by the firm of Longmans, Green, & Co. in New York, lies in the care with which he explains the historical situation of his chosen text. The 'historical situation' sermon is a favourite with some preachers because it is so easily accomplished. But if anything is to be accomplished by means of it, it is most difficult. Mr. Jones succeeds in interjecting his lessons as the narrative proceeds, so that his sermons have no formal application at the end. And yet he is an earnest successful preacher of the gospel.

We end, as we began, with Dr. Banks. Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls publish some volumes for him. To the one before us he or they have given the title of *Sermons which have won Souls*. There is a certain modesty in the title. For the saying is 'he (not it) that winneth souls is wise.' Dr. Banks would give the credit to the sermon. In the end he would not refuse to give the credit to the Holy Ghost. The point is that these sermons were all preached for the purpose of convincing and converting. And it is interesting to know that the freest quotation of poetry, sometimes the quotation of poems of great length, can be made use of to this end.

The Oldest Library in the World and the New Deluge Tablets.

I.

By Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., Lecturer on Assyrian to the University of London.

When, in 1872, the late George Smith published his great discovery of the Babylonian story of the Deluge, every Hebraist and student of the narratives in Genesis was naturally intensely interested. Though defective, the inscription of which he then gave the first translation was in a sufficiently complete state to furnish an exceedingly connected narrative. Since the date of this first publication, the text has been much improved and augmented, and at present fairly trustworthy renderings of it are obtainable.

Many will remember the renewed attention which was directed to the legend when, in the following year, the same Assyriologist was able to announce that he had found at Nineveh a portion of the missing lines of the first column of 'The Chaldean Account of the Deluge.' It was not very much, it is true, and the new text did not fit in very well, but it was thought that further research and the recovery of other missing pieces might explain the difficulty of making it agree with the rest. Doubts, however, as to its being part of the original tablet began to be expressed, and when I came to re-edit, with Sir H. C. Rawlinson, that plate of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* on which it was published, I was so convinced that the little piece belonged to another version that I omitted it from the first column of the Deluge story, in which it had been printed, and placed it among the additions (p. 9) at the end of the volume. The principal reason for supposing that it belonged to a different version was, that the narrative was in the third person instead of being in the first, as in the eleventh tablet of the Gilgameš series.

Another event of importance in connexion with the history of the Flood legend was the discovery, by the Rev. V. Scheil, of a fragment of an archaic version from Sipper, which he acquired and published. This fragment, which has since passed into the possession of the great millionaire, Mr. Pierpont Morgan, is very mutilated, and gives but few details with regard to which comparisons can

be made. Of special note, however, is the statement that the copy was written in the time of Ammi-zaduga, the fourth in descent from Ḫammurabi. This naturally proves the extreme antiquity of the legend; and the numbering of the lines suggests that it had already attained to the importance of a standard work, possibly regarded as belonging to the sacred literature of the country. The colophon also states, that it was the second tablet of its series, which was entitled 'When the man reposed,' a phrase which is explained by Jensen as referring to the occasion of the revealing of the coming of a Flood to the Babylonian Noah in a dream. The tablet discovered by Scheil, when complete, seems to have had no less than 439 lines of writing.

The fragmentary condition of this text is in marked contrast with the now almost perfect document first published by the late G. Smith. Addu (Hadad) seemingly appears therein as the destroyer, and Ea or Aa as the creator (begetter) of man; whilst the Babylonian Noah is mentioned under the name of Atram-ḫasis, 'the exceedingly wise.' It is noteworthy that the chief actor in the bringing of destruction is the god of rain and storms, Hadad, and that, in the version in Genesis, the Flood is caused by the rain. Like G. Smith's version, the Sippar text represents Ea or Aa as protesting against the destruction. The version discovered by the Rev. V. Scheil seems to occupy the whole of the tablet, and contained, according to its discoverer, four columns on each side when complete. It must therefore have been told at much greater length than that already known.

And now, owing to a discovery by Professor Hilprecht,[1] another version, apparently, of the legend of the Flood has come to light. It was found among a number of fragments excavated by the American expedition to Niffer, which that scholar has been studying for some considerable time, and when taken out of the box in which it was sent to Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) was so covered with crystals, that only a few characters were recognizable. Being attracted by the word *âbubi*, 'deluge,' he proceeded to clean the document, a process which, working for an hour or two daily, took about three weeks. Like most tablets from Babylonia, it is of unbaked clay, and measures $2\frac{3}{8}$ in. high by $2\frac{3}{4}$ in. wide, and $\frac{7}{8}$ of an inch at the thickest part. The text on what Professor Hilprecht regards as the obverse is lost, but the reverse has the remains of 14 lines of writing, as far as it is preserved, fairly clear. According to Professor Hilprecht (and his opinion is worthy of all respect), the tablet to which this fragment belonged had been nscribed more than 600 years before the date generally assigned to Moses, and, in fact, even some time before the Patriarch Abraham rescued Lot from the hands of Amraphel of Shinar and Chedorlaomer of Elam.

Unfortunately it is a mere scrap, and has text on one side only, that on the other (the obverse) having been broken away—a fate which overtakes tablets of unbaked clay (as this is) even more than those of clay which is baked. As to the size, Professor Hilprecht estimates the original tablet as having measured about 18 cm. (= 7 in.) high by 24·4 (= 10 in.) wide, and contained a total of about 130 lines of writing. As it was found among the dated and undated tablets of 'Tablet Hill,' it follows *a priori* that it must have been inscribed at the same general epoch. Now the inscriptions of this stratum, he says, were written before the reign of Rîm-Sin of Larsa (about 2000 B.C.), and from other considerations the tablet was written between 2137 and 2005 B.C., or, in round figures, about 2100 B.C. 'This is the very latest date to which this fragment can possibly be assigned, both according to its place of discovery, and the paleographical evidence presented by the tablet itself.'

In the course of his introductory chapters, Professor Hilprecht deals with another inscription, an historical document of the reign of Êrridu (or Enridu) -pizir, who calls himself 'king of Gutî and the four regions.' The people of Gutium or Qutium have long been regarded as of Median race, and under this ruler they captured Nippur and subdued the whole of Babylonia. Was it on account of this that the mountain of the ark was located in Media? As Assyriologists know, a geographical list from the library of Aššur-bani-âpli states that Niṣir, the mountain upon which the boat of Ut-napištem grounded, was so called, and Aššur-naṣir-âpli III. (885–859 B.C.) speaks of Mount Niṣir as being called Kinipa or Kiniba by the people of Lullu, who in ancient times were

[1] *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.* Series D: Researches and Treatises, edited by H. V. Hilprecht. Vol. v. fasciculus 1: *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur*, by H. V. Hilprecht, Philadelphia, published by the University of Pennsylvania, 1910.

neighbours of the Gutî. This mountain of Gutî is associated by Professor Sayce with Jebel Jûdî, which he regards, with great probability, as the late form of the word. Professor Hilprecht is of opinion, with Delitzsch, Billerbeck, and Strack, that Mount Nişir lay originally in the district of the upper courses of the 'Adhaim and Diyâlâ rivers, between lat. 35 and 36. With a subsequent migration of the Gutî northwards, the mountain of the ark migrated with them, and became attached to an unknown range in the neighbourhood of Lake Van, identified in late times as Mount Ararat.

Though Professor Hilprecht's new fragment is so very small, and has not a complete line even in its most perfect part, in all probability it gives us, of all the text which it originally had, the portion which, at present, Assyriologists would most like to have. The number of lines preserved is about 14, with characters varying from 1 to 22 in each, all of them fairly clear, and, as Professor Hilprecht says, of the period of king Rîm-Sin. The following is Professor Hilprecht's transliteration and translation (with slight modifications):—

1. . . . . (?)-ša(?) ši-il(?) i-(?)-. . .-(?)-ka
2. . . . . a-pa-aš - šar
3. . . . . ka-la ni-ši iš-te-niš i-za-bat
4. . . . . -ti la-am a-bu-bi wa - şi - e
5. . . . (?)-a-ni ma-la i-ba-aš-šu-u lu-kin ub-bu-ku lu-pu-ut-tu ḫu-ru-šu.
6. . . ᵗˢᵘ êlippam ra-be-tam bi - ni - ma
7. . . ga-be-e gab - bi lu-bi-nu-uz - za
8. . . ši-i lu ᵗˢᵘ ma-gurgurrum ba-bil-lu na-at-rat na-piš-tim
9. . . . -ri(?) zu-lu-la dan-na zu-ul-lil
10. . . . . te-ip - pu - šu
11. . . . . -lam(?) u-ma-am şi-rim iş-şur ša-me-e
12. . . . . ku-um mi - ni
13. . . . . -pa(?) u ki[n] - ta ru(?)- . . .
14. . . . . u(?) . . . . . .

Translation.

1. . . . . thee,
2. . [the confines of heaven and earth] I will loosen,
3. . [a deluge I will make, and] it shall sweep away all men together;
4. . [but seek thou lif]e before the deluge cometh forth;
5. . [for over all living beings], as many as there are, I will bring overthrow, destruction, annihilation.
6. . . . . build a great ship and
7. . . . . total height shall be its structure.
8. . . . . it shall be a houseboat carrying what has been saved of life.
9. . . . . with a strong deck cover (it).
10. . [The ship] which thou shalt make,
11. . [into it bri]ng the beast of the field, the bird of the heavens,
12. . [and the creeping things, two of everything] instead of a number,
13. . . . . and the family . . .
14. . . . . and (?) . . . . . .

In the photograph (of which Professor Hilprecht has sent me an exceedingly good copy) there are traces of a line before that numbered 1, but the characters are not sufficiently clear to enable them to be read with certainty. Also, in line 1 itself, I should feel inclined to read *ša a-ši-ri-ia*, but all is uncertain, and Professor Hilprecht, who has studied the tablet at first hand, is much more likely to be right. The following are his suggested completions, upon which the restorations in the English version are based:—

2. [*Uṣurat šamê u êrṣitim*] or [*Kippat šamê u êrsitim.*]

3. [*A-bu-ba a-ša-ka-an-ma.*]

4. [*U at-ta-ma še'-e* (or *bul-liṭ*) *na-piš*]-*ti.*

5. The character preceding *-a-ni* looks to me as though it might be the aspirate (ʾ). If this be the case, the completion of the word is more difficult than even the discoverer of the text regards it, and he does not put forward anything more than suggestions.[1] *Ûbbuku* is the Pu'ul of *âbāku*, 'to overthrow,' and *luputtu* is practically a synonym of that word. *Ḫurušu* is probably written for *ḫurrušu*, from *ḫarāšu*, 'to grind,' 'crush.'

6 and 8. The different expressions for 'ship' are noteworthy. The usual word is *êlippu*, 'boat,' and in G. Smith's version it is also called *êkallu*, 'palace'—literally, 'great house,' and *bîtu*, 'house,' simply. Here, however, it is called a ship—literally a 'great boat' (*êlippu rabêtu*). *Ma-gurgurru*[m], which Professor Hilprecht translates 'house-boat,' seems to be connected with *ma-gur*, the Semitic *ma-kurru*, 'shrine' or 'ark,' and if this be the case, it would explain why the Hebrews used the word תֵּבָה. *Gabê* Professor Hilprecht connects with גָּבַהּ, 'to be high'—*gabê gabbi*, 'the whole (or 'total') height.' He has some exceedingly interesting remarks upon the nature of the 'strong deck' with which the craft was covered in, and quotes the first Nineveh version: *kîma âpsî šâši ṣullil-ši*, 'like the Abyss, as for that (boat), cover it in,' and also the

[1] Can it be *gab'āni*, 'heights,' referred to by Professor Hilprecht on p. 52 of his book?

second version: (*ṣulul-ša*) *kîma kippati šamê lû dan êliš*, 'let its covering be strong above like the vault of heaven.' It was, therefore, to all appearance, a house-boat with a domed roof, and the expressions used suggest that the structure within it may have been circular, even if the boat itself were not.

Another important word to which the author of the book refers especially is *mini* in the expression *kum mini*. If the reading be right (and the only other possibility would be to render it as one word, *kummini*, which is less satisfactory), then Professor Hilprecht is justified in comparing it with the Hebrew *lĕmînēhû*, *lĕmînēah*, *lĕmînēhom*, translated 'after its (their) kind.' The rendering which he recommends for the Hebrew, however, is 'instead of its (their) number,'—not seven, or any other number, but two only. If this be the case, it suggests that the writer of this portion of Genesis introduced into his narrative the Babylonian *minu*, which, deprived of its termination, became a homophone of מִן, already used in the narrative of the creation (Gn. i. 24). He cites Delitzsch, *Hebrew Language*, pp. 70 f., and *Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*, pp. 142 ff. He concludes with the following comparisons:—

Nippur Version.	Biblical Version, Gen. 6: 13-20; 7: 11.
Line.	
2: . . . . 'I will loosen.'	7, 11: 'all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened.'
3: . . . 'it shall sweep (or 'take') away all men together';	6, 11: . . 'behold, I will destroy them with the earth.'
4: . . . 'life (?) before the deluge cometh forth.'	18: . . 'but with thee I will establish my covenant.' . . . .
5: . . . over] 'as many as there are, I will bring overthrow, destruction, annihilation.'	17: 'and behold I do bring the deluge upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; everything that is on earth shall perish.'
6: . . . 'build a great boat and'	14: 'make thee an ark.'
7: . . . 'total height shall be its structure';	15: 'and thus shalt thou make it . . . and thirty cubits its height.'
8: . . . 'it shall be a house-boat carrying wha has been saved of life.'	16: 'A roof shalt thou make to the ark, in its (entire) length thou shalt cover it;[1] and the door of the ark thou shalt set in the side therefore; (with) lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.'
9: . . . 'with a strong roof cover it.'	19: And from every living thing, from all flesh, two from everything shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female,
10: . . . the boat] 'which thou shalt make,' . . . . 'into it [bri]ng the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven,'	20: (two) from the birds instead of a number thereof; (two) from the beasts instead of a number thereof; (two) from everything creeping on the ground instead of a number thereof;
11: . . . . 'instead of a number'	18, *b*: 'and thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee.'.
12: . . . 'and family' . .	

Assyrian literature was evidently rich in Flood legends, and it is not to be wondered at that Hebrew literature also contained the account of the great catastrophe. It seems impossible that one or more of these versions should not be augmented and completed as the result of future researches, and it is to be hoped that the prospect will stimulate those who have the wherewithal to renewed effort. Even if the Flood stories do not come to light, there are innumerable other things worth having, which would reward the explorer, and, in turn, delight the subscriber or financier of an expedition.

[Since writing the above, Prof. A. T. Clay has communicated to me his opinion, that the frequent belongs to the Kassite period, and adds that 'no record was kept of finds by Haynes on 4th campaign' (*i.e.* the 4th season of excavations at Niffer.

The writing, judging from the photograph which Prof. Hilprecht has been kind enough to send me, is careful, and such as one would expect from a conservative scribe. I have not had an opportunity of examining many tablets of the Kassite period at first hand, but two tablets of that dynasty in the Amherst collection offer respectively early and late characteristics (one is dated in the reign of Sagarakti-Surias, about 1330 B.C.). It might therefore be argued that no hard and fast line with regard to the date of the script

[1] 'Our English version is evidently wrong here. Cf. Ball, "The Book of Genesis" in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, pp. 5 and 52 f.; also Gunkel's "Genesis" in Nowack's *Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, pp. 129 ff.'

can be drawn, and that the new Deluge-fragment may belong either to the early Kassite or the late Ḫammurabi period. At least one letter of Burra-Burias (1450 B.C.) is written in a similar style, though the characters are larger and less spread (*Tell El-Amarna Tablets of the B.M.*, pl. 10 *b*). *From the Script, therefore,* I should prefer the latter date for Prof. Hilprecht's new fragment.]

II.

By Fritz Hommel, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Munich.

The newly published pamphlet of Professor Hilprecht[1] has caused an unusually great sensation.

In the first thirty-two pages, that is to say, the first half of the work, consisting of four sections, the third and fourth of which (pp. 14–32) are most fascinating, Hilprecht discusses the contents of the ancient Temple Library of Nippur, which he discovered ten years ago, and the greater part of which was buried in 2100 B.C. during an Elamitic invasion. In these pages we see, from most accurate quotations, according to the catalogue numbers, after ten years' work of cataloguing (just completed), that in the reports sent out to Europe by Hilprecht in the year 1900, which were so injudiciously characterized by his American collaborators as fraud and falsehood, not one word too much was said.

The contents of this library, which up to the present include about 20,000 tablets and fragments (a great number of which, however, still lie underground in the ruins of Nippur), are not a whit less rich than those of the much younger library of Sardanapal. Like its younger sister, it also contains lists of cuneiform characters (so-called syllabaries) and ideograms, grammatical paradigms, lists of place-names, gods and temples, plants, stones, and animals, implements, names of professions, and names of measures and months, besides chronological lists,[2] medical prescriptions, oaths against all kinds of misfortune, tables of omens, inscriptions of buildings, purely historical texts,[3] epic fragments, mathematical and astrological tables, and, above all, an abundance of hymns to the gods, written in pure Sumerian, which, at the present time, prove to be of inestimable importance for the development of Assyro-Babylonian religion. For Dr. Hugo Radau, an exceedingly clever collaborator of Hilprecht, has recently, in a fairly long article,[1] reproduced a series of examples of such hymns, which enable us to form a more correct opinion about them. Thus, one of these songs, a song of praise (seventy-seven lines in length) to the goddess Ištar as the morning-star, begins with the following words:

The goddess Istar will I extol, a song of praise will I sing to her,
With cream, dates, and sweet milk, with pastry and seven fishes
Will I load her table, who is called 'Proclaimer of the World.'
Dark wine will I pour out for her,
Clear wine will I pour out for her,
Dark wine and intoxicating drink made from grain [*i.e.* beer].

This introduction to a song composed in pure Sumerian reminds us very forcibly of the beginning of a hymn already handed down in Semitic Babylonian, which probably also emanated from the Nippur Library (*Cuneiform Texts of the Brit. Mus.* vol. xv. pl. i.):

The song of the mistress of the gods will I sing,
. . . . . .
The mother-goddess, her [song is] sweeter than honey and wine.
Is it really sweeter than honey and wine,
Sweeter than grapes and figs,
Than the choicest of purified cream?
Yes, it is sweeter than grapes and figs!

So also in the first line of the song of Moses (Second Book of Moses, chap. 15), we read: 'I will sing Jahweh, for highly exalted is he!' and in passages of the Psalms also, *e.g.* Ps 19^{11}, 'The judgments of Jahweh are sweeter than honey and the honeycomb,' or 119^{103}, 'Thy word is sweeter than honey to my mouth.'

These examples show us at a glance that fixed

[1] *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur* (Philadelphia, 1910, ix and 65 pp. in 8vo).

[2] A list of kings of the period from 2300 to 2000 B.C. (kings of Ur and Nisin), which may be described as a historic monument of the first rank, was published two years ago along with a series of mathematical tables by Hilprecht.

[3] A very important text of this kind, 500 lines in length, will be further discussed below.

[1] 'Miscellaneous Sumerian Texts from the Temple Library of Nippur,' pp. 374–457 of the volume which appeared at the end of January 1910 in honour of Hilprecht, *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume: Studies in Assyriology and Archæology* (with about 45 plates). Thirty European scholars have contributed to this volume, including four Englishmen, ten Frenchmen, and fourteen Germans.

forms of introduction and the poetical similes of Oriental poetry existed in very early times. There is abundant material here for a new history of the art of ancient poetry (so-called poetics).

Besides, Hilprecht gave fuller and more accurate information concerning an almost completely preserved inscription, about 500 lines in length, of an old king of Gutium (cf. the king of the Goi in Gn 14), probably belonging to the time between Sargon of Akkad and the kings of Ur. His name is *Erridu-yizir* or *En-rida-yizir* (*i.e.* 'the Lord has formed a seed' [descendant]), and his title is 'the mighty king of the Guti and the four (sacred) river-banks,' which refers to the sacred wine-country east of the Tigris, between the Hamrin Mountains and the Zagros (or Pushti Kuh); north of this sacred district, which in Sumerian is called 'country of the four quarters of the heavens,' lay the land of Gutium. The most noteworthy feature of this text is that, like the inscriptions of Sargon and those of his son Naram-Sin, it is written not in Sumerian, but in Semitic. It is therefore the oldest Semitic inscription that we possess of this great length.

But the most interesting specimen that Professor Hilprecht gives[1] from the Temple Library of Nippur, which is furnishing more and more, is a fragment of a new recension of the Deluge, which, translated and with the additions which suggest themselves as necessary (put by me in square brackets) runs as follows:

[The springs of the deep] will I open,
[A flood will I send], which will affect all mankind at once.
[But seek thou deliverance], before the flood breaks forth,
[for over all living beings], however many they are, will I bring annihilation, destruction, ruin.
[Take wood and pitch] and build a large ship!
[. . . . . cubits] be its complete height.
[. . . . . .] a house-boat shall it be, containing those who preserve their life.
[. . . . . .] with a strong roofing cover it.
[. . . . . the ship] which thou makest,
[take into it . . . . .] the animals of the fields, the birds of the air
[and the reptiles, two of each] instead of (their whole) number,
[. . . . .] and the family of the . . . . .

The great significance of this fragment, as Hilprecht clearly explains, lies (1) in its extreme antiquity (*c.* 2200 B.C.), and (2) in its connexion with the versions of the Babylonian Deluge-legend, so far known, as well as with the Biblical account of the Deluge, which itself, moreover, can be traced back to two different accounts of similar matter which have been combined. Although the majority of the additions, as we have already said, suggest themselves, the one in the second last line requires a rather long explanation to justify it, for which we refer the reader to Hilprecht's pamphlet. His referring to the Biblical statement (Gn 6^{20}) that two of every kind of animal were to be taken into the ark (the other statement that seven were to be taken [Gn 7^{2}] comes from another account) quite naturally leads him to add a similar statement before the words 'instead of the (*i.e.* their whole) number' (Bab. *kum mini*); for only then do these words have a sensible meaning. But it is necessary to add that the Hebrew words *le-mînê-hu*, which are as a rule wrongly translated 'according to its kind,' must have meant 'for its number,' so that the very same expression appears word for word in Babylonian and in the Old Testament (*mîn* = Bab. *mînu*, 'number').

The most noteworthy difference in our new (though written at such an ancient time) text-fragment of the well-known Assyrian version belonging to Sardanapal's library (seven centuries B.C.), which itself can be traced back to ancient Babylonian times, is that in the latter the sender of the Deluge is the god *En-lil* (or Bel of Nippur), while the saviour of Noah is the Chaldæan supreme god, *Ea*—that is to say, there is a clear antagonism between the Babylonian and the Chaldæan supreme god. The whole thing, therefore, is traced back to a similar disagreement in the pantheon, as if it were a scene of jealousy between Zeus and Poseidon in Olympus. Here, on the contrary, it is, exactly as in the Old Testament, one and the same deity who causes the flood, and determines upon, and takes in hand, the deliverance of his favourite, Noah. In this fact lies the great significance of the new find in the history of religion.

[1] As the work of sifting and cataloguing is proceeding rapidly (there are still about 15,000 numbers to catalogue!), we may be prepared for many more similar surprises during the next ten years.

Literature.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

It was Augustine that gave the title of the Sermon on the Mount to that section of St. Matthew's Gospel which occupies the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters. Augustine was the first commentator to treat of the discourse as a separate entity, and therefore the first to require a distinctive designation for it. But the title was not adopted at once. Not till the Reformation did it come into anything like general use. Its gradual adoption may be traced in the English Bibles. It is not employed by Tindale, but first appears in the Great Bible, from which it was copied into the Bishops' Bible and into the Roman Catholic version of Rheims. The use of it was apparently peculiar to England, which is no doubt the reason why the Rhemish Version copied it. For there is no such title in the Vulgate; nor is it used in the Geneva Version.

The title 'the Sermon on the Mount' must stand now. But it is neither distinctive nor appropriate. The proper title is *The Gospel of the Kingdom.* And that is the title of an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount which has been written by Dr. H. E. Savage, Dean of Lichfield (Longmans, 10s. 6d. net). Dr. Savage takes the Sermon as a single discourse—'virtually a single consecutive utterance' are his words—covering the whole ground belonging to the Kingdom of God. He divides it into seven sections. The first section is the Beatitudes, or the characteristics of the members of the Kingdom; the second, their influence on the world; the third section is the interpretation of the Law; the fourth describes the works of righteousness; the fifth asserts the importance of undistracted service; the sixth is a prophecy of the Church in the world; and the seventh is the test of true discipleship.

But the Dean of Lichfield has a definite and peculiar aim in his exposition. His aim is to interpret the Sermon on the Mount in the light of its own surroundings. He transfers himself to the first century and the Galilæan hillside. Long ago, John Lightfoot, the learned author of the *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, laid down the law that 'in interpreting very many phrases and histories of the New Testment, it is not so much worth what we think of them from notions of our own—feigned upon I know not what grounds—as in what sense these things were understood by the hearers and lookers-on, according to the usual custom and vulgar dialect of the nation' (on Mt 6^{9}). Dr. Savage recovers the rule; for he also believes that the real clue to the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount must lie in seeking to put it back into direct relationship with the ideals and the aspirations to which it refers implicitly throughout.

The exposition is accordingly as delightfully fresh as it is valuable. Take the passage which begins with the words, 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets' (Mt 5^{17-20}). The words and phrases are in Greek, but they are full of Hebrew. 'I came not to destroy,' He says, 'but to fulfil.' We at once think of the frequent expression, 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled.' It is the same verb, but the meaning is not the same. He does not mean here to fill to the full, but to complete, and so bring to an end, the meaning of the Hebrew (*gāmal*, Ps 57^{2} 138^{8}). But not only are the words or phrases Hebraic. The structure of the argument, which proceeds by a series of progressive parallelisms, is Hebraic also. The protest against misconception, 'think not that I came to break down,' is at once balanced by the counter statement, 'I came not to break down, but to fulfil.' Then with this breaking and fulfilling of the Master there corresponds the 'breaking' and 'doing and teaching' of the disciples, with which a step forward is made in the argument. The final statement lays down a positive standard of religious life in the Kingdom, the unfolding of which in detail occupies a large part of the subsequent teaching of the discourse: 'For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

There has been so much wild writing of late about Scotland and its Reformers, so much theorizing without knowledge, and so much display of anti-Reforming paganism, that it is high time some one should come to bring the history back to fact and tell us what the Reformers did and who

they were. No man is better equipped to render this service than Dr. Hay Fleming, and no man could render it with more deliberate purpose.

Dr. Fleming has not written a History of the Reformation in Scotland. The occasion is too urgent for that, the argument is too hot. He has taken account of the perversions and misconceptions and all the culpabilities of preceding historians; and, going back to the sources that he may see for himself and let us see, he has written, as he says, on *The Reformation in Scotland, Causes, Characteristics, Consequences* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net).

He is sure enough of his ground, and enough satisfied of the importance of the work before him, to speak freely. Reading over the book that he may write a preface to it, he is astonished at his own freedom of speech. But the Reformation in Scotland was *not* a political movement. It *was* due in large measure to the scandalous lives of the clergy. And he must say so. In the face of repetition of the contrary till it is almost regarded as beyond dispute, he must prove it. He does not say that the lives of the clergy were the primary cause of the Reformation, even in Scotland. The primary cause, he says, was the dissemination of the Word of God, by printing, preaching, books and ballads. But the clergy were the secondary cause. And he divides their influence into four chapters—(1) Clerical Depravity; (2) Clerical Ignorance and Irreverence; (3) The Conferring of Benefices; and (4) Clerical Credulity, Imposture, and Rapacity.

As for the Reformers, they will stand to be judged even by the standard of our time. Even in respect of the charge of church, altar, and image destruction, the last refuge of their detractors, Dr. Fleming shows that they have been grossly handled. Altogether the book is a hearty, thorough defence of the men who gave Scotland her present place, and he will have to be a well-equipped historian who hopes to trip up the author in his facts.

A SOCIAL REFORMER.

Professor Henry Jones of Glasgow has gathered together a number of papers contributed by him to various periodicals, or otherwise issued. They make a handsome and homogeneous volume, under the title of *The Working Faith of the Social Reformer* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). 'The Working Faith of the Social Reformer' is the title of the first essay, but it serves well for the title of the book, to which it sets the pace. Beneath all social effort that is to be effective there must be faith; and again upon every profession of faith there must follow earnest social effort, else it is that ancient form of faith without works which is dead.

Again, the man of faith and of social effort must be a politician. Professor Jones is a politician. He has a paper on 'The Moral Aspect of the Fiscal Question.' It is one of the longest and most earnestly worded papers in the volume, and there is no doubt of the side which in that great political question Professor Jones has taken.

There is, further, much insistence on an idealistic view of things, an idealistic view of all things. And this also was inevitable.

But the value of the book, its value for all men and all time, lies in the series of articles with which it ends. For these articles pass with no passing controversy, and take no side. They place before us those social responsibilities which are always upon us, and which we have been so long in recognizing the insistence of. The last article is on the 'Services that Society needs.' It is much too short. Now, will Professor Jones write another book, giving that his sole attention?

Marcus Aurelius.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have issued a new volume of 'The World's Epoch-Makers.' It is *Marcus Aurelius and the Later Stoics*, by F. W. Bussell, D.D., Vice-Principal of Brasenose College, Oxford (3s.). Dr. Bussell tells us that he has been long on the book. He has been longer than he means to tell us. For a book like this is the work of a lifetime. Dr. Bussell began it when he went to school, and he has been at it ever since. Perhaps he could have written it in shorter time than he did; the actual writing is of little account. The point is that a book like this is the expression of a man's mind. It is the man himself. Dr. Bussell does not separate himself from the book by writing it, even although he may outgrow it a little.

As for the world it opens to us, the striking thing about it is its modernness. The modern preacher might take the chapter on Detachment into the pulpit with him and preach it; or again, the chapter on Selfishness; with only such modifications as that other law about 'lifting' insists upon. Not that Stoicism is Christianity, but that

the Stoic and the Christian have the same problems, though the one had no clear Christ to look to for their solution, while the other has.

With Fuller References.

We now possess *The New Testament in the Revised Version of 1881, with Fuller References* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 6s. net). The story of the book is told in a preface signed by Dr. A. W. Greenup and Dr. J. Hope Moulton. This is the story. In 1873 the New Testament Company of Revisers appointed Dr. Scrivener and Dr. William Moulton to draw up marginal references. They were ready in 1880, having been prepared on the basis of the references in Dr. Scrivener's Paragraph Bible. But it was found that the work had not all been done on the same scale. The references in the Gospels needed amplification. Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Moulton both died before this could be accomplished. In 1898, after Dr. Moulton's death, an edition of the Revised Version (Old Testament and New) was issued, containing a selection of references, under the editorship of Dr. Stokoe. But Dr. Greenup and Dr. J. H. Moulton, both pupils of Dr. W. Moulton, and one of them his son, were already engaged in completing the original intention of bringing the Gospel references up to the fulness of those in other parts of the New Testament. Now under their editorship the original scheme has been realized; and we have in our hands the New Testament with a list of references, which is the result of incalculable labour and will be of incalculable benefit. It must not be supposed that the references are overwhelming in number. To have made them so would have been to make them useless. It is the combination of fulness and appositeness that gives them their unique value.

The Papyri.

Dr. George Milligan is a student of the papyri and a preacher. His eye is on the papyri for illustration. When he strains his eyes and exercises his patience in deciphering the lining of an old Egyptian coffin, his mind is never quite out of the pulpit. And now when he comes to us with a volume of *Selections from the Greek Papyri* (Cambridge Press; 5s. net), we look for texts, for New Testament words and phrases, for illustrations of New Testament customs; and we do not look in vain.

The papyri are quoted, emended or filled out, translated, annotated, introduced; and all is done to perfection; for it is a scholar's work, and this scholar has found much delight in it. Nevertheless the preacher will rejoice with him in the wealth of new illustrations, and will be very grateful for the excellent indexes of Greek words and Scripture passages.

Hildebrand.

The discovery seems recently to have been made that if history is to be any more read, at least after school, it must be written in detail. We have a great respect in the West for facts; but we are losing our memory for them. We are even losing something of our respect for them, unless they are accompanied with some interpretation and built up into character and conduct. Francis Parkman writes the history of the French attempt to colonize Canada, and takes sixteen volumes, according to the new edition of his history, to write it in. And no history of the French in Canada will be read in future but Parkman's.

But if history is to be written minutely it will have to be written in sections. A good section is always the life of a principal actor. The Right Rev. Arnold Harris Mathew, D.D., has written the history of *The Life and Times of Hildebrand*, and the volume has been published in a very handsome form, enriched with illustration, by Mr. Francis Griffiths (12s. 6d. net). Some may think that the book is too long for the surroundings of a single life. On the contrary, it is too short. No one who reads the book will say that one minute of the time spent upon it has been wasted. He will regret when the end comes that he has not to spend more time. The time would have been wasted, even the whole of it, if it had been a book of half the size, crowded with facts and crammed with dates. For what would have been the use of the facts and the dates even if they could have been remembered? Pope Gregory VII. is here, a man of like passions such as we are, but elected to an office which compelled his conduct to be read and seen of all men. And how could we judge him at all if we did not know the circumstances that ruled the motives, and the motives that determined the acts of his life? After the reading of this book, Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII., is ours.

The Church and Life of To-day.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a volume of short papers under the title of *The*

Church and Life of To-day (6s.). The authors are all clergymen of the Church of England, two-thirds of them either bishops or deans. Most of the topics of present interest are touched—novels, divorce, the parson in politics, training in patriotism, and so on. The touch is very light, the idea evidently being not to give information, but to suggest a point of view and to utter a warning. It is, of course, a somewhat depressing book; but it hurts in order to heal.

Education in Scotland.

Dr. John Kerr, formerly Senior Chief Inspector of Schools and Training Colleges in Scotland, has written a complete history of education in his native land. His title is *Scottish Education, School and University, from Early Times to 1908* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net).

Dr. Kerr could scarcely have used his leisure to better purpose. And the work lay to his hand to do. He had the books beside him, he had the experience behind him. The surprise is that he has not taken the opportunity of indulging an old man's garrulity, but has confined himself to facts, and has gathered the whole history of the education of a fairly well-educated country into a single convenient volume.

William Fiddian Moulton.

There is a life of Dr. Moulton of the Leys in a large octavo volume. It was written for Methodists, and was published in 1899. And now there is a life of Dr. Moulton in a very small volume (Culley; 1s. net). It is written for the whole world. Professor G. G. Findlay was never happier or more acceptable. If he had not written the book, who could have told us within this compass how charming a man Dr. Moulton was? Who could have introduced us to so many men whom we know and love? Who could have cast so pleasant a spiritual atmosphere over it all, so healthy an atmosphere of literature?

The Hebrew Prophets.

So thorough was the review of the first volume of *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers*, edited by Mr. F. H. Woods and Mr. Francis E. Powell, written for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Mr. G. H. Gwilliam, that it will be enough to say simply that the second volume is out. For the same scholarly care and sense of what is useful are carried throughout it. This volume deals with the prophets Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Jeremiah (Clarendon Press; 2s. 6d. net).

Revelation and Inspiration.

The editors of Messrs. Duckworth's series of 'Studies in Theology' did a wise and a courageous thing when they invited Professor Orr of Glasgow to write a volume on *Revelation and Inspiration* (2s. 6d. net). A courageous thing—for all the popular writing on revelation and inspiration at present seems to be in the way of denying the existence of both, and the editors knew that Dr. Orr would vigorously maintain their existence and assert their overwhelming importance. And a wise thing—for the time had come to retrace our steps and begin again with a more positive view of the structure of the Bible, with a clearer recognition of a true supernatural revelation in its history, and with a belief in the inspiration of the record. The time had come for us to *begin* with these things and see what that would lead to. The result justifies the wisdom and the courage of the editors. You may say there is no 'sounder' book in the series than this. You may also say that there is no book in the series likely to outlive it.

A Supplement to Jamieson.

Mr. Alexander Gardner of Paisley, courageous and patriotic, has issued a new edition of Jamieson's *Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, and along with it a *Supplementary Dictionary*, by Dr. Metcalfe. The Supplement may be bought separately (6s. net). It runs to 263 close-printed small-type double-column large octavo pages, and it contains an enormous quantity of slowly gathered facts in the use of the Scottish tongue which had escaped Jamieson and his editors. They are gathered from original sources by virtue of painstaking purposeful reading, though Dr. Metcalfe has used Murray and Wright occasionally. Among the rest we notice a few words from 'Johnnie Gibb' which had eluded previous gleaners. And we notice also some interesting etymologies, such as 'manure' from 'manœuvre,' that is, to work with the hand, already suggested by Trench, and now accepted by Metcalfe.

The Evangelization of the World.

There has been for some time an uneasy feeling that it is no longer possible to trace through the

Old Testament any kind of continuous purpose. A scholar's book which has just been published should go a long way towards setting that uneasy feeling at rest. The Rev. Arthur J. Tait, B.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, has published a book under the title of *Christ and the Nations* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.), in which he traces the purpose of God to redeem the nations of the earth throughout both the Old Testament and the New. There is no doubt of Mr. Tait's scholarship. He is conservative, but he never fails to take account of recent critical studies. His conservatism never strikes one as if it were obstruction. And the result is that from the Protevangelium right on to the great Commission a clear purpose of God can be followed through prophecy, poetry, and history, linking together the books of the Bible and revealing the mind of God in this matter as the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Hence it may be said that Abraham rejoiced to see not only the day of Christ on earth, but our day also; not only the sowing of the seed of the Kingdom, but also the hour before the harvest.

Christian Science.

To the Christian scientist, Miss Georgine Milmine says: 'Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged.' It may not be pleasant for the Christian scientist, and it may not be pleasant for us, but it is necessary. For it does not seem possible to understand Christian science at all without knowing something of its origin. It does not seem possible to understand its fascination without knowing that wonderful woman who sent it on its career and sustains it. Miss Milmine writes *The Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy, and the History of Christian Science* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

Whether the author's own attitude is acceptable to Christian scientists or not, we cannot tell. But we are not dependent on the author. She has made us independent of herself by quoting documents, and by furnishing illustrations. Very likely the Christian scientist of to-day would like to leave behind a good many of the things that are here. And he would be quite entitled to do so if he could. But it does not seem to be possible to pick and choose. A case of healing is quoted from the *Journal* of October 1887: 'Our dog was bitten by a rattlesnake on the tongue a short time ago, and the verdict, as is usual in such cases, was death; but through the understanding of God's promise that we shall handle serpents and not be harmed, if we but believe, I was able to demonstrate over the belief in four days. The dog is now as well as ever.'

That cannot be removed from the *Journal* or from Christian Science. For the *Journal* is full of cases of the kind, and Christian Science does not seem to discriminate between them. And indeed there are much more serious mistakes than that. There are references that make one shudder. On one page we read that Mr. Day called his sermon, 'Sheep, Shepherd, and Shepherdess,' and he considered in turn the disciples, Christ, and Mrs. Eddy. And on the same page there is a quotation from the *Journal* of April 1889: 'To-day Truth has come through the person of a New England girl. . . . From the cradle she gave indications of a divine mission and power which caused *her* mother to "ponder them in her heart."'

St. Paul.

Dr. Garvie has succeeded in writing a clear and complete account of the *Life and Teaching of Paul* within the compass of a volume of the 'Century Bible Handbooks' (Jack; 1s.). He has been able to accomplish it because he had his mind made up already on all the problems, and had entered already into all the Christian experience.

Evolution and the Fall.

Several books by Professor Francis J. Hall, of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, have already been published in this country and have been reviewed in The Expository Times. His new volume deals with the everlasting problem of sin. Its title is *Evolution and the Fall* (Longmans; 5s. net).

Professor Hall seems to have been led to the consideration of this subject by the reading of Dr. Tennant's books. Like Dr. Tennant, he accepts the doctrine of evolution as 'the best available working hypothesis of the origin of species,' and as applicable to the human species among the rest. But he does not believe that the theory of evolution accepted means the doctrine of the Fall rejected. And accordingly he differs from Dr. Tennant at many points, and criticises him. He believes still in a doctrine of original sin, when that doctrine is properly stated. Evolution may be irreconcilable with the Calvinistic

doctrine of original sin, and even with the Augustinian doctrine, though not with the true Catholic doctrine.

What, then, is the true Catholic doctrine of original sin? The essential thing is stated at the outset of the discussion. It is that the word 'sin' in the phrase 'original sin' does not signify either actual sin or personal guilt, but is employed in a secondary sense to describe an inherited defect of nature.

The English Catalogue of Books.

Messrs. Sampson Low, Marston & Co. have issued *The English Catalogue of Books for 1909* (6s. net). To those who have to do with books, whether as writers, sellers, or readers, it is a necessity of life. For it saves the writer from writing books which have been written already. It saves the buyer from buying books that are out of date, or inferior to other books on the same subject, and—the bookseller does not need to be told in how many ways it is indispensable to him. For our own part we have it in constant use for reference — names, dates, editions, and all the rest.

Pentateuchal Criticism.

Mr. Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, has published a volume of *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). The volume is a reprint of articles which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* during the years 1908 and 1909. The criticism of the Old Testament is as hateful to Mr. Wiener as it is to Professor Orr. And he is even more thorough in his hostility to it. But he does not wield the pen of the ready writer, and he does not give us half the pleasure in the reading that Professor Orr did. Mr. Wiener's method may be wrong, but he is certainly painstaking and most particular in the exercise of it. His great argument is that in the criticism of the Old Testament the importance of the versions has been forgotten. He thinks that if Astruc had taken them into account he would never have troubled the world with his different names for God implying different documents. Accordingly, with the versions in his hand he works right through the Pentateuch, disapproving of Astruc and Wellhausen and all their followers at every step.

A New Edition of the Hebrew Bible.

Dr. C. D. Ginsburg is preparing an edition of the *Old Testament in Hebrew* to correspond with Dr. Nestle's edition of the New Testament in Greek, as part of the great editorial scheme for celebrating the centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The superintendent of the translating and editorial department has sent out the Book of Isaiah to let us see what the whole Bible will be. The page is 11 by $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches; the type is large and beautiful; the textual notes occupy on an average about a third of the page. It is going to be the most handsome edition of the Hebrew Bible ever issued in this country.

Adamites and Pre-Adamites.

Messrs. Robert Banks & Son have published a large volume with the title of *The Proscribed and the Chosen of God* (5s.). The author is Mr. Joseph T. Wheeler, who goes back to the very beginning. He is convinced that mankind is all descended from a common stock, but he is equally convinced that Adam was not 'its progenitor'—'for all Biblical students are forced to admit that he was a Caucasian, and evolution cannot work backwards. Even had he been a black man, the first Negro had to have his progenitors in still more primitive beings.'

So there were Pre-Adamites first, and there were Adamites afterwards. The Pre-Adamites lacked cohesive qualities, and were primarily a nomadic people. They therefore needed an inspiration from without, and the Adamites came among them as agriculturalists and as rulers, 'and behold Cain built the first city.'

Now this accounts for our ancient mistake about the Flood, that it was a universal deluge. 'It is quite evident,' says Mr. Wheeler, 'that the Noachians believed themselves to be the only people left on the earth,' and accordingly we used to believe it also.

Well, there is much more to the same purpose in the book. We recommend it for both entertainment and edification.

The Election of Saul.

By the Rev. T. H. Weir, B.D., Lecturer in Arabic at the University of Glasgow.

It is generally recognized that we have in the Books of Samuel two or, it may be, three accounts of the election of the first king of Israel. In the first account Saul is anointed king by Samuel, in order to lead the Israelites against the Philistines, and is bidden seize the first opportunity of fighting (1 S 9^{1}–10^{16}). In the second account, in consequence of the misrule of Samuel's sons (chap. 8), a king is chosen by lot, and the lot falls upon Saul ($10^{17\text{-}27a}$). The sequel to the first account is given in chap. 11, when, about a month after his consecration by Samuel, Saul gains a victory over the Ammonite king Nahash (10^{27b}–11^{15}, omitting v.^{14}). The sequel to the second account is given in chap. 12, in which Samuel formally demits office.

The arguments for and against this analysis have been stated over and over again, yet the following points appear to have been overlooked, and may help to clear away some of the difficulties of the narrative as it stands:—

The first account is considered by critics to be the older of the two, and chap. 9^{1}–10^{16} especially to be a very old piece of narrative indeed. Yet these verses, both in regard to the expressions used and the subject-matter referred to, show a close affinity with some of the latest books of the Old Testament.

It is argued that the people of Jabesh send for help to all the Israelite cities, and *only amongst the rest* to Gibeah where Saul was, he being still unknown. But the point here seems to be that the people of Jabesh were throwing dust in the eyes of the Ammonite king, and, whilst pretending to send messengers in all directions as a forlorn hope, sent them straight to Gibeah to summon Saul. Saul seems to have been well known even before his anointing by Samuel (cf. 9^{20}, and in 9^{17} translate, 'Now Samuel had seen Saul,' etc.).

The difficulty in connexion with Saul's waiting for Samuel at Gilgal (10^{8} 13^{8}) may be explained by supposing that Saul waited literally seven days, whereas by 'seven' Samuel would, of course, mean what we should call eight, counting in both terms.

On the assumption that the present text is a combination of two distinct narratives, the reference in 11^{14} to a 'renewal' of the kingdom has to be set down by critics as a gloss. Yet the method of procedure here detailed is very like that followed by the Arabs on the occasion of the appointment of a new Khalif. The oath of allegiance is taken on the first day by the principal men, and afterwards by all the people. In 10^{27} there is some opposition threatened on the part of the people to the choice of their chiefs (the 'elders' of chap. 8): in chap. 11 this opposition is swept away by Saul's victory.

The fact that Saul is formally chosen by lot in $10^{17ff.}$ is no disproof of his having been already selected by Samuel. The casting of lots may have been a pure matter of form. If this be so, then an exact parallel to the election of Saul will be found in *Joinville's Chronicle*, where he describes how the Tartar tribes met together in order to elect a king who should lead them against the tyrant Prester John. A certain wise man showed them how to proceed. Fifty-two marked arrows, one for each tribe, were placed before a five-year-old child, who was bidden choose one. The arrow of the tribe to which the wise man belonged was chosen. This tribe then selected fifty-two of its wisest men, and fifty-two marked arrows, one for each, were set before the child and he was bidden lift up one. He lifted the arrow of the wise man who had instructed the people. So it was no doubt in the case of Saul and Samuel.

The Oriental historian always leaves much to be filled in by the intelligence of his readers. If his work often seems unintelligible and self-contradictory to us, it is because we have not the knowledge of the circumstances necessary to fill up the gaps. If the above observations be well founded, the narrative of the election of the first king of Israel is intelligible as it stands. It is certain that it was intelligible to the author or 'editor' from whose hands it finally came.

Contributions and Comments.

A Liturgy of Mithras.[1]

It is seven years since the first edition of this remarkable monograph was issued. The author did not live to see the second edition; but Richard Wünsch, who has superintended its publication, has been able to draw upon some notes made by Dieterich for this purpose. These are incorporated in the suggestive addenda (pp. 219–237), which distinguish the second edition from the first. Wünsch there surveys briefly the criticisms passed upon Dieterich's work. The document, it is well known, professes to be a revelation of Mithras written by an initiate into Mithraism, although in its present form it bears extensive traces of gnostic and magical accretion. The latter seems to several experts, like Cumont and Gruppe, to invalidate its claims to authenticity, but Dieterich strongly contends for an authentic nucleus (probably composed 100–150 A.D.), which passed into the cultus during the next half-century, and finally was appropriated by circles interested in magic during the third century. The Parisian papyrus, in which it was discovered, dates from the reign of Diocletian.

The value of the document for the student of early Christianity consists in the rays of light which it throws incidentally upon the contemporary ideas of ecstasy, revelation, regeneration, worship, sacramental union, angels, immortality, and magic in the cults. One or two parallels with the N.T. are of special interest in this connexion; *e.g.* the use of δύναμις in the sense of 'healing power,' medicinal or sacramental, which Dieterich (46–47) thinks must underlie 1 Co 12^{28} (ἔπειτα δ., εἶτα χαρίσματα)[2] as well as Mt 7^{22}, Mk 6^{5}, 2 Co 12^{12}, also the mediation of Mithra's revelation ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου αὐτοῦ as in Apoc 1^{1} (διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ), and several linguistic analogies like ὄψει . . . θείαν θέσιν [*i.e.* the constellation, ἀστροθεσίαν], τοὺς πολεύοντας ἀναβαίνοντας εἰς οὐρανὸν θεοὺς, ἄλλους δὲ καταβαίνοντας = Jn 1^{51} (ὄψεσθε τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας), and αἰτοῦ δὲ ἃ βούλει τὸν θεὸν καὶ δώσει σοι = Mt 7^{7}, Jn 14^{14}. The document generally is an invaluable proof of the genuinely religious and mystical interests which the syncretism of the second century attempted to satisfy. The new edition puts this significance of the liturgy (?) more and more clearly before the modern reader.

James Moffatt.

Broughty Ferry.

[1] *Eine Mithras-Liturgie.* Erläutert von Albrecht Dieterich. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig und Berlin: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner. 1910.

[2] In 1 Co 12^{29} (μὴ πάντες δυνάμεις, μὴ πάντες χαρίσματα ἔχουσιν ἰαμάτων) he makes δυνάμεις depend, like χαρίσματα, on ἔχουσιν.

A Note on Micah i. 2b.

The clause has been usually rendered as in the R.V.: 'And let the Lord God be witness against you, the Lord from his holy temple.' But this rendering is difficult to interpret; for it is not easy to see why the prophet should, thus emphatically, address the peoples and tell them that Jehovah will witness against them, when he immediately proceeds to represent Jehovah as manifesting Himself in judgment, first on Samaria, and then more especially on Judah, and that *without any further reference to the peoples.* We cannot, as older commentators (Ewald, Keil, etc.) have done, explain the words 'against you' with reference to Israel and Judah, for they naturally refer back to 'peoples all of you' in clause *a*, and the reference there, in spite of what Hitzig urged to the contrary (cf. *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*,[3] p. 178), is certainly to more than the 'tribes of Israel,' if not exclusively, to the Gentile world. Nor is it possible to accept as quite satisfactory the explanation of certain more recent commentators, who, while referring the words 'against you' to the peoples, would suppose that the prophet was led to address the latter because he felt that they were as morally corrupt as Israel, and that, when Jehovah (as He was about to do) appeared in judgment against His own people, He would be also witnessing indirectly against them; for this explanation would imply that the prediction of the imminent judgment on Israel is addressed by the prophet *in the first place to the nations* and in view of their welfare rather than, as one would expect, *directly* to Israel, in order to arouse them to a sense of the coming disaster and (if possible) to repentance. Moreover, we might have expected the prophet, if he had their welfare so much at heart, to have made some further reference to the

peoples, but, as we have pointed out, no such reference is to be found in what follows.

It is not surprising, then, to find that several scholars, who adopt the above rendering of the clause, have seen in this and the following verses ($^{2-4}$) an announcement of Jehovah's judgment on the nations, and have, accordingly, regarded the passage as a later addition to the prophecy; and if this rendering is correct, the view would certainly seem to commend itself (cf. further the commentaries of Nowack and Marti). But, as a matter of fact, it would seem to be more than doubtful whether the rendering 'against you' does really convey the sense which the prophet meant to express.

The R.V. margin offers as an alternative rendering 'among you'; and this rendering is adopted by G. A. Smith (*The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, i. pp. 379, 380), who remarks that the Gentile nations 'are summoned in the same sense as Amos summons a few of the nations in chap. $3^{9ff.}$' This is an improvement on 'against you'; and were it not for the fact that there is another rendering which, as we shall presently see, would appear to carry greater weight might well be accepted; for there is nothing improbable in the prophet's summoning the nations to hear Jehovah testify, and, moreover, on this interpretation there would be no need for the prophet to make any further reference to the peoples. There are, however, two passages in the Old Testament which would suggest that בכם (R.V. 'against you') should be understood somewhat differently. The first occurs in 1 S 12^5; the Hebrew reads ויאמר אליהם עד יהוה בכם ועד משיחו היום הזה כי לא מצאתם בידי מאומה ויאמר עד, which is translated in the R.V.: 'And he [Samuel] said unto them, The Lord is *witness against you*, and his anointed is witness this day, that ye have not found aught in my hand. And they said, He is witness.' The rendering 'the Lord is witness against you' is remarkable; for if we read the context of the passage we shall see that the point of the clause is not that Jehovah and His anointed should *witness against* the people, but that they should *witness to* what the latter have affirmed. The people have just (cf. v.^{4}) asserted that Samuel has neither oppressed nor defrauded any of them; and now, in v.^{5}, Samuel requests that Jehovah and His anointed should be recognized by them as witnesses of that assertion, to which they consent. In other words, Jehovah and His anointed are to be the people's witnesses as to what they have affirmed with regard to Samuel's faithful discharge of duty.

The second passage, which we wish to note, is Jos 24^{22}, ויאמר יהושע אל־העם עדים אתם בכם כי־אתם בחרתם לכם את־יהוה לעבד אותו ויאמרו עדים; it occurs in Joshua's farewell address to Israel, at which the latter undertake to serve Jehovah alone. We notice, as in the above passage, the similarly constructed clause עדים אתם בכם; and here again the preposition in בכם is rendered by the R.V. 'against'—'Ye are witnesses *against yourselves* that ye have chosen you the Lord,' etc. But such a rendering of the preposition is at variance with the context. The people might indeed be said to witness against themselves if they had been forced to confess that they had broken a previous engagement to serve Jehovah; but that is not the question here. As the passage stands, the people are described as actually entering into such an engagement, and Joshua is represented as telling them that they must recognize that they have themselves as witnesses of this engagement. In other words, Israel is to be *its own witness* that it has elected to serve Jehovah and not to go after strange gods. It will be obvious, then, from a consideration of these two passages, that the rendering '(witness) against' is not only misleading but really incorrect; and that what is desiderated in both cases is the English equivalent '(witness) for'; by substituting 'for' in place of 'against' in the R.V. the meaning in both 1 S 12^5 and Jos 24^{22} becomes clear and intelligible. In the first passage Samuel says to Israel, 'Jehovah *for you* is witness, and his anointed is witness this day that ye have not found anything in my hand'; to which they reply, '(He is) witness.' Similarly, in the second passage, Joshua says to the people, 'You *for yourselves* are witnesses that you have chosen for yourselves Jehovah in order to serve him'; to which the people reply, '(We are) witnesses.' The preposition ב in both passages is really an *extended* use of the *Beth pretii* (notice how in each case the בכם follows immediately the person who is to witness—in 1 S 12^5 יהוה, and in Jos 24^{22} אתם), and is similar in construction to such phrases as שנה בשנה, עין בעין, etc. The method of expression is no doubt technical and borrowed from the law-courts.

In view of the above interpretation of עד יהוה בכם and עדים אתם בכם, then, it seems not unlikely that the present passage ויהי אדני יהוה בכם לעד is

to be similarly explained. Here the בכם, it will be noticed, follows immediately after יהוה as in 1 S 12[5], and suggests that it is to be taken in close connexion with it: 'And let the Lord Jehovah *for you* be for a witness.' This meaning will suit admirably the context of the verse. The prophet calls on all the nations to hear his message, and bids them regard Jehovah as witness of what they hear him utter. He is so convinced of the truth and certainty of what he has to announce that all the world may hear it, and, what is more, it may have Jehovah as its witness that it has heard. The clause ויהי אדני יהוה בכם לעד, which is further strengthened by the addition אדני מהיכל קדשו, will thus add emphasis to the prophet's appeal in clause *a*; and the verse as a whole will form a fitting introduction to the theophany which follows.

G. G. V. Stonehouse.

Edinburgh.

'A Reed shaken with the Wind' (Matt. xi. 7).

In the course of Talmudic reading, I have come across the following passage which seems to me a possible explanation of the question left unanswered by our Lord. I have not seen it referred to in the many Commentaries I have consulted.

'On that day, R. Simeon B. Eleasar (a Tanna of the fourth generation), entered his Great Beth-ha-Midrash, and preached: "Let a man be always soft (pliable) like a reed, and not hard (unbending) like a cedar. For just as this reed, all the winds come and blow on it, and it sways to and fro therewith. But when the winds cease, the reed returns and stands in its place. Therefore the reed is rewarded that a pen is taken from it to write with it a Book of the Law. But a cedar does not abide in its place; for when the north wind blows he is uprooted and cast down. And what is the end of the cedar? The woodmen come and cut him up and build houses therewith, and the rest is cast into the fire. Hence has it been said, "Let a man always be as pliable as a reed, and not unbending as a cedar"' (Abboth de R. Nathan, ch. 41).

Instead, therefore, of assuming, as almost all commentators have done, that our Lord meant to answer His own question in the negative, and to say that John was *not* such a reed, and that notwithstanding this appearance, he was not changing, inconstant, irresolute, but rather firm and resolute, as he had always been, our Lord meant to answer His question in the affirmative, and to say: 'It is true, that in the storm of doubt and despondency passing over his soul, John was like "a reed shaken with the wind," brought very low, almost swallowed up by the waterfloods. But once my message shall reach him, the storm shall cease; peace shall possess his soul, and like "a reed" he shall lift up his head, stand upright, and remain firm and faithful.'

Our Lord used a simile understood by all, who were acquainted with the nature of the reed growing by the Jordan (as also by the Barada, the river of Damascus, as seen by the present writer). There was no need to give an answer, for it was obvious to all.

Note.—In Bab. Talmud Taanith, 20b, the story is given as of R. Eleasar b. Simeon. But both in Abboth and in Tract. Derech Eretz, ch. 4, where the story is related with some variations, it is told as of R. Simeon b. Eleasar.

C. P. Sherman.

Hexham.

John v.–x.

Where were the disciples?

In Jn 5. 7. 8. 10 we have no references to Christ's disciples as accompanying Him in His visits to Jerusalem; at 9[2] a single question is put by 'his disciples' to the Master. It is true, of course, that we have 'disciples' at 8[31], but there the word is a predicate, offered by Jesus (conditionally) to certain 'Jews who had believed,' but whose half-faith seems quickly to die away (vv.[33-59]). Nor is 9[27. 28] anything different; and even the perplexing verse, 7[3], constitutes no true exception. Now, in the early ministry assigned to Judea and Jerusalem, and again in chaps. 11 ff., 'the disciples' are noted at every turn. So also in Samaria (chap. 4), and almost always in Galilee (2[1-12] 6[3. 12. 16. 20]). Also, upon at least one occasion in chaps. 5–10, Jesus (7[10]) goes up to Jerusalem 'as it were in secret.' Is it conceivable that Jesus is to be thought of as visiting Jerusalem *alone*—perhaps while the Twelve or the Seventy were evangelizing elsewhere (Rush Rhees proposes to synchronize chaps. 9 and 10 with the mission of the Seventy, but allows Christ the company of 'a few disciples,' presumably because of 9[2]. And certainly chap. 9 is living and graphic as chaps. 5. 7. 8 are not.)

Three questions arise:

1. Has this view been proposed? A very learned colleague has referred me, for one discussion of it, to Dr. Smith's book, *The Days of His Flesh*. But I have not succeeded in finding such a passage.

2. Is this view a tenable interpretation of the Evangelist's meaning?

3. Is it historically credible? Granted Christ as *Pastor Pastorum*, it is awkward to suppose that the 'Training of the Twelve' was so frequently interrupted. But, on the other hand, it might be less hopeless—or more feasible—to defend the historicity of repeated Jerusalem ministries, in spite of the silence of Synoptic tradition, if the Twelve mostly stayed in the provinces.

Manchester. ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Revelation xiv. 13.

IN your interesting commentary on Rev 14^{13} you mention three possible explanations of the difficult expression *from henceforth*. The marginal reading of the A.V. suggests a fourth. It gives 'from henceforth saith the Spirit, Yea.' This, coupled with your idea that the spirit is the responsive spirit in the mind of the seer, gives a very good sense. After all that has happened in the way both of suffering and of illumination, the Christian spirit is now, *henceforth*, clear as to the blessedness of the dead in the Lord. F. V. PRATT.

Angaston, S.A.

Luke xi. 41.

THE emendation of Luke 11^{41} (*dakki* for *zakki*) made in Mr. Montefiore's Commentary, and commended by Professor Cheyne (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April, p. 292), has already been made by Wellhausen in his *Das Evangelium Lucæ* (1904). L. KÖHLER.

Aengst (Zürich).

Acts xvii. 39.

NEITHER Palmer nor Scrivener (in their editions of the Greek Text adopted by the A.V. and the R.V.) has a note that the different renderings in this verse rest on different punctuation. A.V.: 'Into which they were minded, *if* it were possible, to thrust in the ship' (ἐβουλεύσαντο, εἰ δύναιντο, ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον). R.V.: 'And they took counsel, *whether* they could drive the ship upon it' (ἐβουλεύοντο, εἰ δύναιντο ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον). For the latter construction compare Lk 14^{31}. It is perhaps worth while to quote a parallel passage from Xenophon's *Anabasis*, II. v. 2, where editors and commentators diverge in the same way: ἔδοξε τῷ Κλεάρχῳ συγγενέσθαι τῷ Τισσαφέρνει καὶ εἴ πως δύναιτο παῦσαι τὰς ὑποψίας πρὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν πόλεμον γενέσθαι. Not thinking of the possibility (or not approving of it) of taking εἴ πως δύναιτο like the A.V. '*if* it were possible,' Cobet and Dindorf struck out καὶ and translated like the R.V. 'whether he could.' In Xenophon, § 4, ὅπως, εἰ δυναίμεθα, ἐξέλοιμεν ἀλλήλων τὴν ἀπιστίαν, favours the A.V. Preuschen, in his New Greek Dictionary, does not even mention the construction followed by the Revised Version. The same passage of Xenophon is, by the way, a good parallel to the recent friendly visits between England and Germany: τὰς τοιαύτας ἀγνωμοσύνας νομίζων συνουσίαις μάλιστα ἂν παύεσθαι.

Maulbronn. EB. NESTLE.

The 'Index Biblicus' of the Vulgate.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxi. 530, the Rev. Professor A. Condamin says: 'The *Index Biblicus*, published for the first time in 1571 A.D., possesses no official character.' Then he quotes a remark of the edition of Tournay of 1885, that Vercellone left it out. But it is repeated in the edition of M. Hetzenauer (Oeniponte, 1906), and it is found, as Hetzenauer says, in the Vatican editions, 'annorum 1593 and 1598.' A certain 'official character' belongs, therefore, also to this Index. It seems, however, to be missing in most copies of the Vatican edition of 1593, for instance in the copies in the British Museum (1214 *h* 4; 3022 *f* 1).

Maulbronn. EB. NESTLE.

Two Mistakes in the 'Revised New Testament.'

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, XV. 95, I called attention to two mistakes in the Revised Version (Mk 6^{25}, Lk 15^{26}). The latter has been corrected in several impressions. Both are corrected in the *Interlinear Bible*, 1906; but both recur in the latest Oxford edition: *The New Testament in the Revised Version of 1881, with Fuller References* (Oxford University Press, 1910). Both are also found in the edition issued in connexion with the Centenary of the B.F.B.C., 1904.

Maulbronn. EB. NESTLE.

Entre Nous.

Professor Sanday's article 'Bible.'

THERE is a fine review of the second volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS in the *Guardian* for the 1st of April. Here are the last two paragraphs:

'For the student of Christian theology, however, the two most important contributions to the volume are those headed "Bible," by Dr. Sanday, and "Bible in the Church," by Dr. von Dobschütz, of Strasburg. The latter fills some seventy columns, and is a monument of learning. Written in a spirit of true reverence for the Bible, it will attract many readers, and the admirable arrangement of the several sections, as well as the directness and simplicity of the style, will enhance its usefulness. Dr. Sanday's article extends to about half the length of Dr. von Dobschütz's, is written freely, and not overburdened with references. We have read it twice, and we know of nothing which, in anything like the same space, provides so clear and impressive an account of the attitude which the best Christian scholarship in our day assumes in reference to Holy Scripture. It will be a great pity if this essay is not published separately, for it would be a real service to the Christian Faith in England to ensure its wide circulation. To say this is to say much, but to say less would not be just.

'It remains to add that Dr. Hastings has again been fortunate in securing the co-operation of at least one leading Roman Catholic divine. The Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., supplies a learned paper touching "Bulls and Briefs," a subject on which he is eminently qualified to write. It is of course historical, not controversial, and the bibliographical information which he gives will be useful to those who are engaged in research:—

> '"It is generally held," he points out, "by (Roman) Catholic theologians that the mere fact of an encyclical being addressed to the whole of Christendom does not constitute it an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement, even if it deals with dogmatic matters. The degree in which the infallible *magisterium* of the Papacy is involved must be judged from the terms used in the document itself and from attendant circumstances."

The last-mentioned test leaves a way open, as some will hope, for a reconsideration by the Vatican of some utterances, at least, which have been generally regarded by the Roman Church as fortified by infallible authority.'

Point and Illustration.

Vulgarity.

Under the title of 'Along the Road,' Mr. Arthur C. Benson has an article every week in the *Church Family Newspaper*. The subject for April 1st was Vulgarity.

Mr. Benson says there are two kinds of vulgarity, the one a superficial and harmless thing, the other a rank and deep-seated quality of soul. 'I remember once,' he says, 'being told by a lady who did a great deal of philanthropic work, that the most curious etiquette prevailed in some of the houses she used to visit about behaviour at meals. At one house, in drinking tea, the spoon had to be put in the cup and held firmly against the side of it with the forefinger, while the little finger had to be held out away from the cup with an air of graceful detachment. At another house, when you had drunk all the tea you cared to drink, you turned your cup upside down in the saucer. The two households appeared to be of exactly the same social standing; but my friend found out that the spoonholders considered the inversion of the cup to be vulgar, while the inverters thought spoon-holding to be pretentious. The odd thing is that one should be amused by this, and think both practices alike absurd, when one is oneself just as exacting in the use of the knife. I should consider that it would be a sign of inferior breeding for a man to shovel green peas into his mouth with a knife, however convenient; and I suppose that a man who naturally used his knife so would consider my prodding and dawdling with a fork under the same circumstances to be simply affectation.'

That is the superficial kind of vulgarity. Then he gives examples of the deep-seated kind.

'Some of the most innately vulgar people I have known have been people of irreproachable courtesy and demeanour; but one gradually perceives that their standard is all wrong, that they put the wrong values on people, that they do not like men and women because they are likeable or interesting, but because they are important. The man who keeps one kind of geniality for a countess and another for a farmer's wife is very hard to respect. There is no sort of reason why a man should migrate from one class to another. If he is born an earl, there is no harm in his consorting with earls; but he must not treat an offensive earl with courtesy, and an inoffensive farmer with discourtesy. There is a pleasant old story of a duke who got into a railway compartment occupied by another duke and a commercial traveller. He talked affably with both. When he got out, the commercial traveller, impressed by the respect with which he was received at the station, inquired of one of the porters who he was, and on hearing the fact, said genially to the other duke, "Now, that's what I call a gentleman! To think of his sitting here, hobnobbing with a couple of snobs like you and me." One only wishes that one could have heard his further reflexions when his other fellow-traveller left him, and he discovered his identity as well.'

The Eastern Atmosphere.

Two things have to be done for the reader of the Bible before he can make right profitable use of it. He must be made to understand first that it is the translation of a book from an Eastern language into a Western; and next, that the English translation itself is ancient and antiquated. Does any man among us, unlearned or learned, realize what three centuries have done to the language of the English Bible? That they have put some words out of use altogether is a small part of their effect. The serious situation is that they have slightly shifted the emphasis or slightly altered the meaning of an innumerable number of words. But it is not about the antiquated English that we have something to say at present. It is about the Eastern language in which the Bible was originally written.

We say Eastern language. For although the New Testament has come to us in Greek, it is the Greek of the East and not of the West. It is the Greek of men who continued to think in Hebrew, although they wrote in Greek. The Greek language of the New Testament is like a palimpsest with the upper writing a translation of the under. Before we can understand it we must get at the unseen Aramaic that lies below.

In the *Sunday at Home*, the Rev. G. Wauchope Stewart has begun some popular studies of the Eastern ways of thinking that lie below the language of the Bible. 'If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me' (Ps $139^{9.10}$). How much the verses gain in significance when we realize that to the Jew, in virtue of his geographical situation, the sea stood for the west! The morning, of course, represents the east, the direction of sunrise, and the wings of the morning refers to the rapidity with which the morning light flies through the heavens. So that the sense of the passage is: 'If I could fly with the rapidity of light from the one end of the world to the other, from extreme east to extreme west, even then I could not escape from Jehovah.'

'O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?' (Mt 3^{7}). The word sounds harsh to us, and it is probable that, not knowing the local association, we do the Baptist injustice. The reference is probably to a scene familiar enough to the hearers. In order to prepare the ground for the plough it is customary to set fire to the stubble, which is left much higher than with us. When the fields are thus ablaze, the serpents which have been lurking in the long stubble may be seen wriggling out, trying to escape. So the word 'vipers' was a natural word to use, and the emphasis is not on it, but on the effort to escape from the wrath to come.

'Doth he not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness?' (Lk 15^{4}). To our minds the wilderness does not suggest safety. It seems rather to be the place where the single sheep may be found which has gone astray. But the word 'wilderness' was used to denote tracts of land quite suitable for pasture, with sheep folds and even human habitations. The five thousand were fed in the wilderness, and yet they were commanded to sit down upon the green grass.

'Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands' (Is 49^{16}). It was the practice of the worshipper to mark the name or sign of his god on his body, to remind him of his duty towards

him. Here by a bold anthropomorphism the position is reversed, and instead of the worshipper marking the name of his god upon his hands, it is Jehovah who is represented as marking Jerusalem upon His hands, as a reminder, so to speak, of her desperate plight. It is a most beautiful and comforting assurance of the love of God.

For a Season.

This is the topic of a sermon by the Rev. Thomas Spurgeon which is published in *The Sword and Trowel* for April. The first text is from Ec 3^1, 'To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven.' The word season, says Mr. Spurgeon, suggests the due time—the time for harvest or for snow. And what is life but a succession of seasons? But the word 'season' also stands for the convenient time. A word spoken in season, how good it is. That is introductory.

The next text is He 11^{25}, 'Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.' So sin has its pleasures. And just because it is fascinating is it dangerous. The pleasures of sin have to be superseded by higher pleasures. But the pleasures of sin are only for a season. The joys of the ungodly are like the crackling of thorns under a pot. That is the old simile. Mr. Spurgeon's own modern one is that they are like the Crystal Palace fireworks, beautiful while they last, but leaving the night blacker.

The third text is Jn 5^{35}, 'He was a burning and a shining light, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.' It is the word of Christ concerning those who listened with some interest to John the Baptist. They listened until he began to speak of repentance. Then the audience lost their interest and began to melt away. So the new preacher is almost always sure of an audience until he begins to lay the axe at the root of the tree.

The fourth text is Lk 4^{13}, 'And when the devil had ended all the temptation he departed from him for a season.' When did he return? Mr. Spurgeon thinks that between the temptation in the Wilderness and the agony in the Garden Satan was busy with the Son of God all the time. If he did not appear in person he used the lawyers or such like to catch Him in His words. He thinks that Satan was never so busy, for he knew it was now or never. Still, Satan left Him for a season. Christ had at least some respite from temptation. No doubt he pretended to have left Him altogether. He makes this pretence with us when we have beaten him once. And if we have beaten him off without seeing that his place is occupied by a better, he will come in stronger force, and our last state may be worse than our first.

The last text is 1 Peter 1^6, 'Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations.' If need be, thank God for that. Nothing happens by chance to God's people. And the manifold temptations are not the temptations of the devil just spoken about. They are the trials of life, and accordingly the season now is the season of life itself. How short it is compared with the eternity of the weight of glory that is to follow.

Worthily.

In the April issue of the *Missionary Record* of the United Free Church of Scotland, there is a study by the Rev. Adam Philip, M.A., Longforgan, of the word 'worthily.'

There are three occurrences of the word—Ro 16^2, Ph 1^{27}, 3 Jn ^{6}. But Wyclif is the only one, says Mr. Philip, of all the great English translators who translates the Greek word consistently. The A.V. gives Ro 16^2 'as becometh saints,' Ph 1^{27} 'as it becometh the gospel,' 3 Jn ^{6} 'after a godly sort.' R.V. has Ro 16^2 'worthily of the saints,' Ph 1^{27} 'as it becometh the gospel,' 3 Jn ^{6} 'worthily of God.' Wyclif translates 'worthili to seyntis,' 'worthili to the gospel,' 'worthili to God.'

1. 'Worthily of the Saints,' or, as Dr. Sanday would put it, 'worthily of the Church.' This is an ideal of life. When Dean Lake was asked to give his impressions of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, he wrote: 'I should say in two words that he impressed upon us above everything the blessing of high ideals and of decided convictions.' This, then, is the first high ideal—to live worthily of the Church. For the Christian Church represents at once the noblest fellowship, the highest character, and the loftiest service.

2. 'Worthily of the gospel.' What is the standard of life that the gospel sets before us? The gospel is the grace of God in Christ. To live worthily of the gospel is to be tender with

its tenderness, to be steadfast as its truth, to know and to exhibit the grace of Jesus Christ.

3. 'Worthily of God.' This is from the Third Epistle of John, which is a missionary letter. John says we should encourage the missionary by setting him forward on his journey worthily of God. For he is fulfilling God's purpose, he is carrying God's power. To encourage the missionary worthily of God is to recognize him to be a fellow-worker with God. We need what Mazzini called the tug of the ideal to disturb our self-complacency and content, and to enable us to hear God's command and see God's glory, as Polycarp finely expresses it.

Serving and Seeing.

It were not hard, we think, to serve Him,
If we could only see!
If He would stand with that gaze intense
Burning into our bodily sense,
If we might look on that face most tender,
The brows where the scars are turned to splendour;
Might catch the light of His smile so sweet,
And view the marks on His hands and feet,
How loyal we should be!
It were not hard, we think, to serve Him,
If we could only see!

It were not hard, He says, to see Him,
If we would only serve:
'He that doeth the will of heaven,
To him shall knowledge and sight be given.'
While for His presence we sit repining,
Never we see His countenance shining;
They who toil where His reapers be
The glow of His smile may always see,
And their faith can never swerve.
It were not hard, He says, to see Him,
If we would only serve.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Donald Grigor, Walkerburn, to whom a copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for June must be received by the 1st of May. The text is Rev $22^{3.4}$.

The Great Text for July is Rev 22^{14}—'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' A copy of Walker's *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister and his Duties*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 22^{17}—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.' A copy of Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Ps 1^{3}—'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' A copy of Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Adams's *Israel's Ideal*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Ps 4^{6}:

'Many there be that say, Who will shew us any good?
Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.'

A copy of Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, or Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Inge's *Faith and Knowledge*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his new book on *The Approach to the Social Question* (Macmillan; 5s. net), Professor Peabody says that both for Religion and the Social Question the most imminent peril of contemporary thought is the peril of provincialism.

And what is provincialism? It is 'the handling of great truths as if they were small and shut-in experiences, set in a corner of life as the special concern of a single class.' Professor Peabody has to find out the reason why the Church is so reluctant to take up the Social Question, the reason also why the Social worker will have nothing to do with the Church. In both cases this is the reason.

It is quite clear to Professor Peabody that the Church is reluctant to take up the Social Question. There are many devout people who view with scepticism, if not with hostility, the deflecting of religion from its traditional path of worship to these new ways of work, and the exhausting of the instincts of piety in the activities of philanthropy. Religion, they have been taught to believe, means a personal redemption from sin, or a definite allegiance to Christ; and to identify religion with boys' clubs, gymnasiums, and social settlements, seems to them in some degree disloyal to the cause they are pledged to serve.

And these devout people, it must be confessed, have sometimes been supplied with an excuse for their suspicion. It has lately been suggested, says Professor Peabody—his reference is to the *Spectator* of January 19, 1907—that religion might be defined as 'philanthropy, touched and warmed by reverence for Jesus Christ.' And such a definition is likely enough to seem to many Christians 'not only grotesquely insufficient, but also completely unhistorical.' They might easily be apprehensive lest philanthropy might become so touching and warm as to take the place of reverence for Jesus Christ.

For this is just the danger, and this is the only excuse for the antipathy, that deeds which ought to be the product of Religion, are made to appear as if they owed nothing to Religion. They appear to be made a substitute for faith, rather than its expression; and when the flower bears another name, the very beauty of it becomes an affront to Religion. In short, the religion of deed looks as if it were determined to supplant the religion of creed, and the love of man were likely to appropriate those emotions which once were dedicated to the love of God.

On the other hand, those who are most concerned with the Social Question often regard Religion with indifference or even with contempt.

At the hour when religious people meet for worship, unions of hand-workers meet to deliberate on industrial problems and programmes, and do not hesitate to claim that these debates are quite as instructive and uplifting as sermons. 'My associates,' the President of the American Federation of Labour has announced, 'have come to look upon the Church and the ministry as the apologists and defenders of the wrong committed against the interests of the people. They use their exalted positions to discourage and discountenance all practical efforts of the toilers to lift themselves out of the slough of despondency and despair.'

Professor PEABODY is firmly convinced that the Church has no just reason for looking coldly on the Social worker, and the Social worker has no just reason for standing aloof from the Church. Both are guilty of provincialism. Both take too narrow a view of that which moves them to their deepest interest. If Religion represented nothing but ecclesiastical machinery and dogmatic opinions, and if the Social Question represented nothing but a programme for the distribution of industrial profits, then they would certainly occupy regions so remote from each other that loyalty to one might mean betrayal of the other. There is little in common, says Professor PEABODY, between debates on the orders of the clergy or the condition of sinners after death and discussions of a wage-scale or an eight-hour day.

But if both Religion and the Social Question are primarily concerned with life, conduct, duty, feeling, hope; if both are interpretations of experience in the world that now is,—then it is not only needless, it is impossible, to hold them asunder.

What the Church has to see is that Religion and the Social Question are falsely set in opposition, or even compared together. Religion is the tree, Social Service is its fruit. Those religious ideals and aspirations which expressed themselves otherwise in other generations, are in this generation reappearing in forms of the Social Question. Emotions which once uttered themselves in prayer, conversion, and oral pledges, are now uttering themselves in philanthropy, social service, and industrial reform. But life is still found in losing it. The test of discipleship, 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' is still the same. The cardinal sin of religion is still the sin of Cain, 'Am I my brother's keeper?' The most precious words of self-dedication to human service are still the words of Jesus, 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.'

'For lo, the kingdom of God is within you' (Lk 17^{21}). So the Authorized Version, with the margin, '*or*, among you'; and so the Revised Version, with the margin, '*or*, in the midst of you.'

Professor VON DOBSCHÜTZ of Strassburg (whose article on the BIBLE IN THE CHURCH in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* has brought him much into notice lately) discusses the phrase in *The Expositor* for April. He believes that the Greek words (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) 'will go through the whole history of interpretation, and will perhaps never come to a final decision.' Yet he himself decides firmly enough for 'within you.'

For it seems to him that the only doubt which really exists is whether or not St. Luke translates the original Aramaic correctly. That doubt will never be resolved. But granting that he does, then the phrase itself is enough to fix the meaning to 'within you.' For if the Evangelist had intended to say 'in the midst of you,' he would have used another word. He would have used the word (ἐμμέσῳ) which he uses elsewhere more than a dozen times in the sense of 'in the midst'; and not a word which he never uses in that sense again.

And the language, Professor VON DOBSCHÜTZ believes, is supported by the sense. For the inwardness of the Kingdom, if not stated expressly

in other sayings of Jesus, is quite in the line of what He says about clean and unclean: 'There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man'; 'for from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed . . . and defile the man' (Mk 7^{15-21}).

There is no passage in the New Testament, and there cannot be many in the Old, that have been the occasion of more perplexity than the passage which describes the cursing of the barren fig-tree. Those who have little time to gather together for themselves the efforts at interpretation which have been made, from St. Augustine onward, will find them conveniently arranged in the entertaining pages of Dr. James Morison's *Commentary on St. Mark*. And they will be none the less entertained that Dr. Morison himself also, just for once, goes altogether astray.

There is, indeed (to begin with Dr. Morison), no explanation that we find less acceptable in these days than the suggestion that Christ knew all the time that there were no figs on that fig-tree, so that the coming and the cursing were simply symbolical actions on His part. It will always be easier to believe in Christ's ignorance than in His pretence. At the present time there is no room for comparison.

But this is not the only, or even the greatest, difficulty. When we admit Christ's ignorance, we have still to account for the apparent absurdity of His looking for figs when, as St. Mark says, it was not yet the season of figs. And then we have to explain the apparent petulance of His 'answer' when He was disappointed. For we are told that He answered and said to the fig-tree, 'No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever.'

We need not resent the use of words like ignorance, absurdity, petulance. Scholars who retain some reverence use them freely here. If these words express the facts, let us ascertain the facts, and then use the words that express them. If they do not, let us use the words temporarily that we may get rid of them once for all.

Now there is no greater remissness that the interpreters of this passage, reverent and irreverent, have shown than the remissness to ascertain the facts. There are two sets of facts to be ascertained. First, the facts about fig-trees generally, and then the facts about this particular fig-tree.

What are the facts about fig-trees in general? One is that they bear two (not three) crops of figs in a season. In the early spring small green knobs or 'buttons' appear at the ends of the twigs. These buttons are called *paggim*. They are referred to in Canticles 2^{13}—'the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land; the fig-tree putteth forth her green figs.' The *paggim* gradually increase in size, and are ripe about the beginning of June or even the end of May.

That is one fact. Another is that these early figs appear on the old wood, the wood of the previous year's growth. Now, in the *Nation* for April 2, there is a fine rhythmical translation of that beautiful passage in Canticles. But it is marred by a very small slip, due to ignorance of this fact.

The translation is as follows:

Arise, my love, my beloved, and come away;
The winter is past, and the rain is over and done
In the land, and the time of the singing of birds is begun;
The flowers that appear on the earth have made it their stay;
The fig putteth forth new green figs on the tender spray.

It is in the last line that the mistake is made. The new green figs of the spring are not found

on the 'tender spray.' They are found on the old wood of the previous summer.

Another fact is that simultaneously with these early spring 'buttons,' or a little behind them, there appear the leaf buds. These leaf buds and the small green figs develop together, so that, if all is well with it, when the tree is clothed with leaves it should also be laden with figs. Many of these figs never ripen. They are the 'unripe figs' which the fig-tree casteth, when she is shaken of a great wind (Rev 6^{13}).

Yet another fact is this. The 'unripe figs' at the time when they fall from the tree, although only as large as a cherry, may be, and are, eaten. They are eaten by the fellahin as they fall, and it is surprising how well a few of them will stay one's hunger. They may sometimes even be seen exposed for sale in the market in Jerusalem.

The rest is easy. As the first green figs are developing and the leaves developing with them, the buds of the second crop begin to form on the new wood which the season has produced. These buds grow into the figs which form the larger and better crop of the year. They reach their maturity in August or September.

Now if these are the facts about fig-trees in general, what are the facts about this particular fig-tree? The one important fact is that it was in leaf. The season was early. It was not the time for figs. But where there are leaves there ought to be figs. Jesus was hungry, and seeing a fig-tree 'afar off'—it was conspicuous by its early leafage—He came to it 'if haply,' if by any possibility, notwithstanding the season of the year, He might find figs on it.

He expected that season's figs. He did not expect to find figs of last season still hanging upon the tree. There is no proof that the figs of last season do hang on a fig-tree throughout the winter. During thirty-three years' residence in Syria, Professor Post searched and inquired for them in vain. But even if some one else were to come and declare that he had found them, that is not the point. The point is that this tree had leaves. That is why Christ saw it and came up to it. Last season's fruit, if there were such a thing, would more easily be seen on a leafless tree. This tree had leaves. And a tree that had new leaves, however early, ought also to have new figs.

But it had no figs. It had leaves only. What then? Then He might have passed on, disappointed and hungry. But He had a deeper disappointment in His heart already, and a deeper hunger. He was on the way going up to Jerusalem. He had longed exceedingly to gather fruit of *that* tree, but he had been bitterly disappointed. The fig-tree suddenly stood for the City. And as He pronounced the curse of perpetual sterility, He pronounced it on the tree as a visible sign of that religious barrenness to which Jerusalem had resigned herself.

It was all quite natural. Nothing has to be read into the story. No perplexity is found in it. The perplexity arises when we find men standing in astonishment before the cursing of an innocent, senseless fig-tree, unable to see that what they call the disappointed petulance of Jesus was the great sorrow of heart He felt for that city over which He cried the exceeding bitter cry, 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, and ye would not!'

'And his disciples heard it.' St. Mark notes the fact. Yes, they heard and remembered it. They remembered and recorded it; not for the sake of the fig-tree, but for Jerusalem's sake. But how different is this from the suggestion that the whole scene was an acted parable. To save what is called Christ's ignorance, it is suggested that He knew, as soon as He saw the tree afar off, that it had nothing but leaves, and yet solemnly walked up to it with the disciples as if He expected figs. To save His ignorance,—as if we had anything to

do with His ignorance. If there is one thing on earth we are ignorant of, it is just this ignorance of Jesus on earth. 'Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee,'—we call that omniscience. 'He came, if haply he might find anything thereon,'—we call that ignorance. But they both belong to Jesus. And we have simply to accept them both.

In the issue of the *Nation* for April 2 there is an article on 'Faith.'

Mr. James Parsons was a watchmaker in Cornhill. His watches were known all over the world for their accuracy. When the time came for him to retire, he refused to let his name go with the business to another. 'No watch,' he said, 'shall bear my name which has not passed through my hands.' He retired to Axhaven, a little town on the coast.

One day in August, Parsons set out for a walk to a village five miles distant. The shortest road lay across the shallow basin of the outlet to the river, which was so twisted at that point that often it was quite calm inside when outside it was rough. Within three hours of high water the river was fordable. The middle of the estuary, in consequence of a rise in the river-bed, was dry for some time after low water, and was surmounted by a huge stone or smooth rock, the top of which at neap tide was never quite submerged. At a distance of about twenty feet on each side ran a fairly deep channel. Supported by the rock was a tide gauge, with feet and inches marked on it.

When Parsons came to the river on his way home, it was about half-past three in the afternoon, and the neap tide had just begun to flow. It was intensely hot. He crossed the first channel and lay down to rest for a moment on the sand, close to the gauge and under the rock. He fell asleep. When he awoke it was dusk, and the sun had just set. The water had risen till it almost reached his knees when he stood up. He waded to the edge of each channel. They were both out of his depth, and he could not swim.

Parsons knew by his almanac that it was high water at the gauge at 8.57 p.m. that day. His watch showed 7.30 p.m. If it was really 7.30, the tide would continue to rise for an hour and twenty-seven minutes only, and would not touch his lips. If the watch had gained; if, say, it was actually only 7.20, the tide would flow for ten minutes longer, and he might be drowned. He could trust a watch of his own making. He could trust this perfect little instrument unhesitatingly. Up to eight o'clock he was at peace.

Suddenly he was assaulted with horrible fears. He had not tested the watch for some time. He had not used it much lately. That was a fact. But what kind of fact was it? It was worthless. The watch had often gone for months together, and had not lost or won to the extent of a minute. He reasoned with himself. He went over the same reasons again and again. But his nerves shook. A ghastly dread paralyzed him. He pictured himself lying on the sand down there. He saw himself carried home in a cart to-morrow.

Then he looked again at his watch. It was 8.30. He looked at the gauge. The water was exactly the height that it ought to be. Still the struggle continued. With all his might he fought; he stiffened himself, and drew his arms rigidly down by his side. Lo! in an instant his faith was restored; the flutter of his heart ceased; the adversary spread his wings and was seen no more.

Parsons, when he told the story, used to say that the adventure was a trial of his faith. He believed in his watch. He must believe it. How could he mistrust hundreds of tests? Nevertheless, his belief was impotent. Faith was wanting.

Faith is not belief in fact, demonstration, or promise. It is sensibility to the due influence of the fact, something which enables us to act upon it—the susceptibility to all the strength there is in the fact, so that we are controlled by it. Nobody can precisely define it. All we can say about it is that it comes by the grace of God, and that failure to see the truth is not so lamentable as failure to be moved by it.

The article is signed by the name of MARK RUTHERFORD.

The Traditions of the Masai.[1]

BY FRITZ HOMMEL, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH.

I.

THE statements of the late Captain Merker, which caused such a sensation at the time, about the legends of the Masai, which are so remarkably similar to the early history of the Hebrews, are capable of arousing the most widespread interest even at the present day. The question has not yet been settled whether these legends are really traditions preserved for thousands of years from the original Arabian home of the Masai, or whether Christian (or even Jewish) influence must be admitted. It is well known that Merker himself was firmly convinced of the absolute impossibility of the latter hypothesis; and if such an influence did take place—which is extremely unlikely, for the reasons which I shall point out below—it must have happened at any rate in earlier times, when the Masai still dwelt in the north in the neighbourhood of Abyssinia; but this, again, is open to grave doubts.

In the first place, it is quite out of the question that Merker, whose trustworthiness is beyond all doubt, had been imposed upon. As a matter of fact, it was only after long acquaintance with the Masai of his province that he won the confidence of those old Masai men who at last communicated to him the traditions, as a rule, anxiously guarded from strangers. Our Bavarian fellow-countryman, Deeg, who is a distinguished authority on the Masai, and authorities on Africa like Schillings and Dr. Ludwig Sander, are also perfectly convinced that Christian influence through the missionaries is clearly impossible, since these worked there for only a comparatively short time, and the proud and warlike Masai were still very unresponsive to their exertions. When the English missionary to the Masai, Albert R. Steggall, who was active among them from 1889 to 1905, says (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June 1906, xvii. p. 429) that Mr. A. C. Hollis, the eminent authority on the Masai of English East Africa, told him of a Masai boy in his employ, 'that the Masai from whom Captain Merker got much of his information was for some years, during the Masai Famine, connected with a Roman Catholic Mission in the neighbourhood, as indeed were many others, besides those who came under instruction in the Church Missionary Society's station in Taveta,' I can apply that, as Merker himself told me, only to a Masai man from whom he got other information; for naturally he had quite different informants for the many inquiries on which his ethnological work is founded (morals, customs, names, etc.). And Hollis's protest,[2] that, as he (Hollis) had also associated for years with the Masai of his district, he should also have come on the track of such traditions, is only an *argumentum e silentio*. Either the Southern Masai (in German East Africa), among whom Merker worked, are more faithful

[1] In connexion with the 2nd ed. of Moritz Merker, *Die Masai*, which has just appeared (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1910). The present article is taken from pp. xiii–xxii of the preface (with a few additions made specially for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES).

[2] In a personal communication from the investigator, for whom I have a great respect, and whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making at Oxford in 1908 (at the Congress for the History of Religions). In the year 1907, I also had the opportunity of meeting the late Captain Merker personally, after having previously corresponded with him—which was of extremely great value to me in connexion with the much-disputed Masai question.

guardians of these ancient treasures—which is not impossible—or Merker was more fortunate in gaining their confidence on this point also than Hollis, who had not got at the right people just then. In the preface to the first edition, Merker certainly makes special mention of the fact that it was not until during the fifth year after he started his work that he came across those traditions from primitive times, which do not as a rule live in the mouths of the people but are hereditary in certain families, and then are invariably to be found only among a few old men; and Merker took a year and a half to make a thorough examination of what he has given in his fourth chapter. Besides, even according to Hollis (cf. C. Eliot's introduction to A. C. Hollis, *The Masai: Their Language and Folklore*, p. xix), the monotheism of the Masai and their imageless worship of God ('they have definite prayers and they petition the deity more frequently and fervently than the surrounding tribes are known to do') are beyond doubt; and, on the whole, a comparison between the book of Hollis, which appeared shortly after Merker's book, and Merker's *Masai* is the best defence of the trustworthiness of Merker's ethnological as well as his linguistic observations.

Another eminent African investigator, the celebrated linguist, Carl Meinhof of Berlin (now Hamburg), has attacked, in the first place—for linguist reasons—Merker's description of the Masai as a 'Semitic race,' and, in the second place, the hypothesis that their original home was Arabia.[1] But the opinion of the Arabist Schwally of Giessen about the Masai traditions (*Archiv. für Rel.-Gesch.*, 1906, ix. p. 505), that in them 'features of Semitic origin are well grafted on to African' (but 'when and in what circumstances it is difficult to say') is true also of the language, as I was able to ascertain from an exhaustive study of Hollis's book. Unmistakable survivals make it clear that the Masai must at one time have been Semites, and, what is more, Arabian Semites. This will be briefly discussed in the following paragraphs.

Their own tradition is not the only evidence that they came from the north; that fact is confirmed by a comparison between some of their numerals and those of the Cushite languages (especially Somali and Galla) and of Nuba. Cf. the following list, to which I have added, from Hollis's new book,[2] the numerals of the Nandi—a race closely akin to the Masai:

	Nuba	Galla	Somali	Masai	Nandi	
1	*wēr*	toko	kau	obo	...	1
2	owu, *ora*	lama	laba	*are*	aeng	2
4	kemso	afur	afar	ongwan	angwan	4
6	gorjo	dya	*leh*	*ille*	*lo*	6
7	kolloda	*torb*	*tadoba*	...	*tessab*	7
8	iduwo	*zadet*	*sidet*	*isyet*	*sisi*	8
9	*oskoda*	*zagal*	*sagal*	anderoit, *sal*	*sokol*	9
10	*dimenu*	...	*toban*	*tomon*	*taman*	10
20	aro	*digetam*	*iubatun*	*tigitam*	*tiptem*	20
30	...	*zodoma*	*sudun*	*osom*	*sosom*	30
40	...	*afurtam*	*afartam*	*artam*	*artam*	40
50	...	...	*kuntun*	*onom*	*konom*	50
100	*imil*	...	*boghol*	ip	*pokol*	60 / 100

In its purely Semitic syntax, too, the Masai language is closely related to Galla and Somali, while in this respect the rest of the Cushite languages (cf. on this point my *Grundriss der Geogr. und Gesch. des alten Orients*, p. 154 f.) show far more Nuba influence. And the purely Semitic basis of the so-called 'imperfect scheme' may still be plainly shown to underlie the whole Masai conjugation; cf. the following:

1. sing. *a-suj*, I follow.	pl. *ki-suj*, we follow.
2. sing. *i-suj*, thou followest.	pl. *i-suju-suju*, you follow.
3. sing. *e-suj*, he follows.	pl. *e-suj*, they follow.

Here, corresponding to a letter-change to be observed also in Masai, *i* is the weakened form of *ti*, and *ki* has arisen from *ni*,[3] so that we must assume as the earliest forms:

1. sing. *a-suj*;	cf. Somali	*aqan*, I know.
2. sing. *ti-suj*;	,,	,,	*ta-qan*, thou knowest.
3. sing. *ye-suj*;	,,	,,	*ya-qan*, he knows.
1. pl. *ni-suj*;	,,	,,	*na-qan*, we know.
2. pl. *ti-sujû*;	,,	,,	*ta-qanen*, you know.
3. pl. *ye-sujû*	,,	,,	*ya-qanen*, they know.

This is exactly the Semitic conjugation scheme (*e.g.* Arab. *a-kun*, *ta-kun*, *ya-kun*; pl. *nakun*, *takûnû*,

[1] Cf. his review in *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.*, 1904, xxxvi. pp. 735–744.

[2] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi: Their Language and Folklore*, with Introduction by C. Eliot. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.) 1909, xl. 328 pp.

[3] Cf. *ki-suj*, 'thou followest me,' from *ni-suj*, or (Hollis, *Masai*, p. 73) the change of the affixes *-ki* and *-ni*), or (p. 61) *tu-suja-ki*, 'follow me' (from *tu-suja-ni*), or (p. 56) *amelok*, but perf. *ata-melono*, or (p. 36) *oti klein*, fem. *kiti* (in contrast with *ado*, 'high,' fem. *nado*); and also *i* from *ti* (Hollis, p. 15), *naito*, 'the girl,' for *na-tito*, or (p. 58) *a-ikena*, 'I counted it,' for *a-t-ikena*, or (p. 61) *i-suja*, 'wash him,' for *ti-isuja*.

yakûnû), transferred from Arabia to the Cushite languages. Besides, in spite of the fact that the Masai vocabulary and much of its grammar is so very Africanized, it shows many traces which clearly point to an original Arabian home. Among these I count the conjunctions *o*, 'and' (from *wa*), and the consecutive *pe*, 'and,' 'so that' (Hollis, p. 100), which is exactly the difference so characteristic of Arabic between *wa* and *fa*; the remains of the formation of individual names by the ending *-a* (*il-akir*, 'stars,' *ol-akira*, 'a particular star' [Hollis, p. xxi]); the double function of the particle *ma* ('not' as well as 'that,' as in Somali; cf. Arab. *ma*, 'not' and 'that which'); and separate characteristic words which can hardly be later loan-words, but must be looked upon as ancient remains, such as *ramesa*, 'night' (Arab. *râmis*, 'night-bird,' *rams*, 'grave'), *sararua*, 'navel' (Arab. *surra*), *sero*, 'forest' (Arab. *sarw*, 'wood-mountain,' originally 'cypress-forest'), *kunoni*, 'smith' (Arab. *kain*), *remet*, 'spear' (Arab. *rumḥ*), *moruo*, 'older man,' 'husband' (Arab. *maru'*), *ure*, 'to fear' (Arab. *wara'a*); 'sun' and 'day' fem. ('night' and 'moon,' on the contrary, masc.); cf. also Arab. *šams*, 'sun' fem., and the phrase *al-lail wa 'n-nahâr*,[1] 'night and day,' alongside of *al-yaum wa 'l-laila*. Some plural forms in Masai point distinctly to the South Arabian Mahra language (therefore the dialect of the incense-country), from which the so-called Ethiopian language originates, *e.g. ing-aïtin* from *eng-aï*, *il-apaitin* from *ol-apa*, etc. (Hollis, p. 25); cf. in Mahra *ebelûten* (from *aybel*, 'flint'), *haidenten* (from *haidên*, 'ear'); similarly Ethiopic *enta* (fem.), 'which,' and Masai *enna*, fem. of *elle*, and also the feminine article *en* (in contrast with masc. *ol*). According to Hollis (p. 275), the Pleiades (*gokwa*; cf. S. Arab. *kôkabân*) with the Masai consist of six stars only,[2] as in the pictorial representations of South Arabian epitaphs ⁂ (different from the seven circles of the Babylonian Nergal-symbol ⊙⊙⊙°; cf. Zec 3^9 and 4^{10}, the seven eyes of Jahweh); the name of the holder of the religious tradition of the Masai, *el-kiboron*, coincides in a remarkable way with the word for 'priest,' *kabîr*, in the old Minæan inscriptions of Yemen.[3] The peculiarly European word *dengel*, 'maiden' (originally, of course, 'young wife'), is the same as the Masai *en-dangile*, 'young wife' (after circumcision); 'tongs,' *el-garamet*, is the Arab. *el-kullâbat*, 'cow-bell,' *eng-gurugur*, the Arab. *al-gulgul*, and *en-abere*, 'spear,' perhaps Arab. *el-ibra*, 'needle.' The name of the species of climbing-plant, *mogongora*, from which the Masai get a fragrant wood for sacred purposes (Merker, p. 20, and cf. p. 150, *ol-magirigirieni*, a vanilla-smelling perfume), very forcibly recalls the S. Arab. name for 'incense,' *mugr*; for, as a rule, the repetition of the second half of a word, of which the Masai are so fond (*e.g. gadardar*, name of a tree, *airašaraš*, 'a shrub'), is just as much a peculiarity of Ethiopic, where it is used especially for the formation of names of colours (*waraḳraḳ*, 'gold-green' = Heb. *yeraḳraḳ*, *ḥamalmîl*, 'green,' but also *ḍabarbîr*, 'ridge-like' = hill, and the Tigr. plant-names *gondefdafe*, *endufduf*, *amferfaro*, and *handugdug*). These are all sure traces which completely justify Merker's designation of the Masai as originally a Semitic, and more specifically an Arabic, race.

[1] *Nahâr* is an old feminine form (afterwards no longer recognized as such) of the word *fa'âl* from *nûr*, 'light'; *lail* is the masc. of *laila* (older form *lailat*) with the same meaning, 'night.'

[2] It should also be observed that, as with the Babylonians, besides *kakkabu*, 'star' (Arab. *kaukab*), there was an older *kabkabu* (P.N. *Bel-kapkapi*, var. *Igur-kabkabu*, locating Enlil or Ekur = Bel in the north pole, certainly referred to the polar star, so also the Masai possessed, besides *gokwa* = *kabâ(n)* = Pleiades, another word *kopekob* meaning 'north.' It is known for certain that *kaukab*, 'star,' goes back to the older *kabkab*, and it is proved directly by the Mahra form *kibekt̄b*, *kibkob* (D. H. Müller, *Die Mehri- und Sogotri-sprache*, iii. 46). These two Masai words (for 'Pleiades' and 'north pole star') point to very ancient Babylonian-East-Arabian influence.

[3] There is also a Masai custom, according to which, when a Masai is inside a hut with a woman, he sticks his spear in front of it, so that no other man may enter (Merker, pp. 84 and 120), which agrees remarkably with the similar custom related by Strabo (bk. xvi.) of the Southern Arabs (only 'staff' here instead of 'spear'). And the fact that the 'speaker' is at the head of the warriors recalls South Arabia (cf. *kail*, 'chief,' properly 'speaker,' and *saiyid*, 'lord,' probably possesses the same etymology; cf. Syriac *sewâd*, 'speech').

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION XXII. 3, 4.

'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.'

THERE is a striking contrast, says Anderson Scott,[1] between the Christian anticipation of heaven as here portrayed and the non-Christian pictures of Paradise. And this is true not only of the pictures painted by the fancy of the Greeks, or by the ingenuity of Muhammad, but also of those which would be most familiar to St. John, the pictures of Paradise which are found in the later Jewish literature. Without being sensual in the evil significance of the word, as are some of the other extra-Biblical anticipations, those of the Jewish Apocalypses are largely, if not mainly, sensuous; that is to say, they delight to represent the righteous as enjoying in Paradise the pleasures of physical life which may have been denied to them on earth. In contrast with this, in the Apocalypse of St. John, while the judgments are depicted in terms of events which had actually occurred in history, or which do occur in human experience, the description of the joys and glories of the redeemed is remarkable by the *omission* of nearly everything corresponding to the experience of enjoyment on earth. The features of the heavenly condition are either negative (no more sea, no more night, no more death, no more curse), or spiritual and religious (the tabernacle of God is with men, His name shall be on their foreheads).

In our text we have the New City characterized both negatively and positively—negatively in the absence of any curse, positively in the presence of the throne of God and the occupation of His servants.

We find that in the Old Testament Cain is a natural foil to the saints mentioned in the text. 'There shall be no curse any more,' says John. Of Cain it is said, 'Cursed art thou from the ground' (Gn 4^{11}). In the text there is stability of the saints in the city of God; Cain is a fugitive and a wanderer in the earth. Once more, it is written, 'His servants shall do him service.' To Cain even the service of the earth will be unfruitful. The saints in the New Jerusalem are to see the face of God; Cain says of himself, 'From thy face shall I be hid.' Lastly, God's name is to be on the foreheads of the inhabitants of the city with the foundations. On Cain's forehead is a sign that he is an outcast. The toilers of the city rejoice and labour in the presence of God always; Cain must go out from the presence of the Lord.

I.

THE CURSE.

St. John uses an unusual word (κατάθεμα) for 'curse,' a word which occurs nowhere else in Biblical Greek, although the verb formed from it is found in Mt 26^{74}. Swete thinks it is somewhat stronger than the ordinary word *anathema*—an execration, and not simply a ban. 'No execrated or execrable person or thing shall be found in the Holy City.' The sentence would then be equivalent to, and practically a repetition of, Rev 21^{27}, 'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie.'

Macdougall, in his book on *The Fields of France*, tells how the game preserves become annually impracticable for the chase owing to the presence of sweet flowers. Every May a beautiful fault frustrates the sport, for, thick as grass, the lily of the valley springs in all the brakes and shady places. The scent of the game will not lie across these miles of blossom. The hunters are in despair, and the deer, still deafened with the winter's yelp of the hounds, beholds himself at last befriended by an ally more invincible than water or forest oak, by the sweet and innumerable white lilies that every May-time send the huntsmen home. Feeding among the perfumed flowers the gazelle exults in delight and safety. Even so among the sweet flowers of the heavenly paradise no danger can come to the redeemed. 'There shall be no curse any more.'

But it is possible to take the words as expressing negatively the condition of the redeemed. To the citizens of the City of God there will be no curse any more, because—

1. There will be no indwelling sin. The flesh will no longer lust against the spirit (Gal 5^{27}). When we would do good (Ro 7^{21}), good and not evil will be present with us.

2. There will be no temptation. At least there will be no temptation for which a way of escape will be not only provided but also made use of.

[1] *The Book of the Revelation*, 306.

That old serpent the devil, the occasion of the great temptation, will be absent. And however there may be opportunity for the exercise of the will, the will of man will delight to do the will of God.

3. There will be none of the results of sin—no sorrow, no suffering, no disease, no death. All these are of the former things which now have passed away.

Lord Jesus, be our Guide;
O lead us safely on,
Till night and grief and sin and death
Are past, and heaven is won.

II.

The Throne of God and of the Lamb.

1. *The throne of God.* The throne of God indicates the supremacy of God. The expression occurs in the Apocalypse thirty-six times. And God's supremacy will not only be actual as it is now, but universally recognized as it is not now. At present His reign is largely a reign of suspension, of waiting, of patience. This is true, as regards both those that oppose, and those that serve Him. He does not put forth all His power to deliver His servants, nor to restrain and punish His enemies. Hence much of the mystery and seeming contradiction of life. But there is a mercy in the mystery. If He does not crush and destroy His enemies, it is that He is 'not willing that any should perish' (2 P 3^9); and if He does not immediately deliver His servants from all the seeming evil of life, it is because they need the discipline of pain and conflict, that they may be truly fitted for the perfect life. But to that life He will surely lead them; and even here we see a progress towards that consummation, as regards both the subdual of evil and the deliverance and victory of the good.

Many people more or less consciously recoil from the assertion of a claim so imperative as is necessarily involved in such a conception of the Supreme. Some actually reject religion on this account: they think, or speak as if they thought, that their independence would be compromised, their dignity insulted, by the recognition of a Sovereign in heaven, no less than by subjection to a master on earth; perhaps they go so far as to say that the very notion of a God claiming to have dominion over man's whole being is an invention of the governing orders, a piece of the machinery devised by their class-selfishness for the obvious purpose of 'keeping the people down.' Others, who cannot dispense with religion altogether, endeavour, as far as possible, to keep the idea of Divine Sovereignty in the background. Perhaps they may in part be under the influence of a recoil from one-sided and repellent views of that Sovereignty, which were a stumbling-block to believers in the Divine moral perfection. But the reaction must be worse than extravagant which leads men to emphasize 'the Fatherhood of God' by detaching from it, in effect, the idea of paternal authority; as if there were no significance in the words of the last prophet, 'If I be a Father, where is Mine honour? and if I be a Master, where is My fear?'[1]

2. *The throne of the Lamb.* That is to say, the supremacy of God will be a supremacy of love. We can hardly mistake the connotation of qualities belonging to this name—'the Lamb.' John the Baptist used it, when he bore witness to Jesus, saying, as the young spring lambs were sporting in the fields around, the very symbols of innocence, patience, and gentleness, 'See, that is God's Lamb!' And was not this the character of Christ, as He was here among men? But the use of the expression has also a reference to the wonderful and precious incarnation of the Son of God. The people of God are familiarly known, in the Old and New Testaments alike, as God's flock; and how significant, then, that the Shepherd of the sheep should be spoken of as a Lamb—a Lamb of the flock of God—one of themselves, sharing their nature, and living their life! This comes out in that beautiful foretelling of the life of the heavenly ones, in which we read that 'the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their Shepherd, and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life' (Rev 7^{17}).

We know where John got that title for Christ—'the Lamb.' It is almost peculiar to himself. We catch the note in Isaiah; we hear the name in an Epistle of Peter, and in the Acts of the Apostles as a quotation from the evangelical prophet. But with John it is a most familiar term. John the best beloved of all the disciples of Jesus, loves this sweet symbol, and delights to speak of his Lord as 'the Lamb.' This John had been a disciple of that other John, the Baptist, whose chief and choicest sermon, which lingered most in his mind and memory, was couched in words like these—'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' John the Baptist struck a note which vibrated throughout the whole life of John the Divine. In Patmos John recalls his early impressions, for old men delight in the scenes and sayings of their youth.

[1] W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, 131.

The power thus conferred upon Him, the Lamb not only possesses by right and title, but He exercises it in deed and in truth. 'All power,' said our risen Redeemer, 'is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' He rules now with unlimited sway: and the sceptre of His kingdom is a right sceptre. As Joseph was exalted in Egypt, and Pharaoh said, See, I have set thee over all the land; and the people cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt: even so we read of Jesus, God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

In one of the suburbs we met a shepherd and a flock of sheep. The shepherd had got a sheep upon his shoulders, its fore feet were held under his chin by his left hand, and his right grasped his staff. While his collie dog was driving the sheep aside to let our carriage pass, I entered into conversation with the shepherd, and said, 'That's a heavy load you've got there.' He answered, 'Oh! it's not so heavy when you're used to it.' I asked, 'What's the matter with the sheep?' 'It's lame, sir.' 'How far are you from home?' I asked again. 'About four miles, sir,' 'And will you have to carry it the whole way?' Looking at me with some degree of contempt for my ignorance, he said, 'He'd never get home if I didn't.'

3. *The throne of God and of the Lamb.* There is only one throne, God and the Lamb are not divided. The Lamb is God, and the interests of God and the Lamb are one. The one kingdom of God, even the Father, is identical with the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is upon the throne reigning there, clothed bodily with all the power of the Godhead. The Lamb is on the throne. Co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, very God He is, very God He always was. We do not forget the glory which He had with the Father or ever the world was, but it is as God-man Mediator that He is now, in His complex person, invested with heavenly honours.

The throne of God is the throne of an absolute monarch who doeth as He wills among the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of this lower world. From that throne the proclamation comes like a peal of thunder, 'The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble.' God's throne of sovereignty is not a throne of arbitrary power, for the Lord is perfect and holy, and His will is just and right. In acting according to the purpose of His own will, He abounds towards us in all wisdom and goodness. The sternness of law is linked with the sweetness of love; because while the throne of heaven is the throne of God, it is still the throne of the Lamb. I fear that I fail to find the words that will express my thoughts; but this empire of God and the Lamb endears itself to our hearts. There is about it a kingly kindliness, and a majestic mercy most charming to the mind. Do any ask, What throne is that? To whom does it belong? We answer, It is the throne of the great and glorious God, and it is the throne of the lowly lovely Lamb. The glorious Lord is gentle as a child; the Lamb is lordly as a lion. Referring to the Book sealed with seven seals, described in the fifth chapter, St. Bernard said, 'John heard of a lion and saw a lamb; the lamb opened the book and appeared a lion.' But, behold here it is, 'the throne of God and of the Lamb.' Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, O seer; the place whereon thou standest is holy ground, for God is here. Come, little children, there is charm enough to entice you; for the Lamb is here. It is the throne of God, therefore fall down before it with awe and self-abasement; but it is the throne of the Lamb, therefore you may stand up before it without fear.[1]

III.

His Servants.

This is the third part of our text. First, we are assured that nothing cursed or having power to curse shall be there. Next, we are told that power and love shall be enthroned in the city. Then our eyes are directed to those who submit to this power, doing the commandments of God, the sum of which is always 'Thou shalt love.' They are called His servants, or rather His slaves; and three statements are made about them:

1. They shall do Him service. That is their occupation.

2. They shall see His face. That is their privilege.

3. His name shall be on their foreheads. That is the mark of their ownership.

Or if we wish to assist the memory, we might say that we have here Service, Satisfaction, and Sanctification.

I. His Servants shall do Him Service.

1. The two expressions for 'servant' and 'serve' are not related to one another in the Greek, as they are in the English, but are two quite independent words; the former meaning literally 'a slave,' and the latter being exclusively confined in Scripture to one kind of service. It would

[1] C. H. Spurgeon, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, No. 1576, p. 20.

never be employed for any service that a man did for a man; it is exclusively a religious word, and means only the service that men do for God, whether in specific acts of so-called worship or in the wider worship of daily life.

The Gospel reveals a new and special ground for the obligation of God's service; He has acquired a supernatural right over us in virtue of the fact of our redemption. If we have been bought, in the Scriptural imagery, at no less a price than the blood of God's own Son, it follows that 'we are not our own': we cannot be 'without law to God,' we must be 'under law to Christ.' Two phrases are employed in the New Testament in order to impress this thought upon us. In some passages a word is used which originally represented the condition of a hired servant, as when St. Paul speaks of the God whose he is and whom he 'serves,' or when he professes that he 'serves God in his spirit' or 'in a pure conscience';—or when the Epistle to the Hebrews describes the Christian conscience as 'cleansed by the blood of Christ, from dead works, to serve the living God' (λατρεύω, Ac 27^{23}, Ro 1^{9}, 2 Ti 1^{3}, He 9^{14}). But as if this term were not strong enough to stand alone, the relation between a bondservant or slave, and a master whose rights over him were absolute,—a relation which Christianity was to undermine, but which for the time was suffered to exist,—is utilised, so to speak, for the purpose of enforcing this great lesson. Four times does St. Paul, himself the Apostle, as he is called, of spiritual freedom, adopt the title of 'a slave of God' or of 'Christ': a title used also by St. Peter, by St. John, by St. James, and by St. Jude (δοῦλος, Ro 1^{1}, Gal 1^{10}, Ph 1^{1}, Tit 1^{1}, 2 P 1^{1}, Rev 1^{1}, Ja 1^{1}, Jude 1^{1}). We find St. Paul exhorting Christian slaves to carry into their whole routine of obedience to earthly lords the sense of duty to 'the Lord Christ,' and pressing upon earthly lords, in turn, the fact too that they are subject to the self-same Lord in heaven. We are still bondservants, he says, though [not in the old sense of Jewish legalism: our members must be presented as 'slaves to righteousness'; to be 'made free from sin' is to become, in a fuller sense, 'enslaved to God.'[1]

Given the idea of a living God, the conviction that we are bound to serve Him follows; and Scripture does but emphasize the conclusion which natural reason forces upon all serious Theists. 'I am thy servant' is the burden of all that intercourse between the human soul and its God which pervades and vitalizes the Psalter: and the prophet's language about 'the Lord's Servant' passes beyond an 'idealized Israel' to its fulfilment in the obedience completed on the Cross. And although the gospel is a 'law of liberty,' yet no delusive spirit from the pit ever uttered a deeper falsehood than that which could confound liberty with licence, or deny that moral law is involved in the relations between men and a moral God.

[1] W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, 134.

It is no unfit time just now to invigorate our remembrance of that truth. Even within the most living circles of the Christian Church, just now *the sense of duty* surely is not at its strongest. Life, and energy, and holy hope and gladness,—in many quarters these are indeed on the increase, not on the wane. But the will to do a divine Master's will—not our liking, but His bidding; the sober strength of Christian character; the weight and fixity of principle; the jealousy that conscience is kept void of offence in the plain duties of the common day,—this is not a thing so often to be found. Nevertheless, this thing is an essential in the seed sown here which is to issue in the life of heaven. 'For it is written that *His servants* there shall serve Him still.'

Take just one noble and beautiful instance of the combination of obedience and love, of service and joyfulness, in Polycarp who had apparently been consecrated to the episcopate by St. John, and who, when invited to save his life by uttering some form of renunciation of Christ, answered, 'Eighty-six years have I been His servant, and He has done me no wrong: how, then, can I revile my King who saved me.'[2]

A company of monks, centuries ago, having read together the Book of Revelation, fell to discussing the relative attractiveness of the promises contained in it. One pointed to, 'God shall wipe away all tears' as the best of them all. Another selected, 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne.' But the third, who was Thomas à Kempis, claimed as the most glorious of all, 'His servants shall serve him.'

2. What are the characteristics of their service?

(1) *Continuity.* Death is not an end of the activities and energies which have been consecrated to God. It is not the great breaking off it seems to those who stand around and see its work, but the setting free of old powers for new developments. If one looks back it seems the end of a career; if forward, it seems a career's beginning: in reality it is neither, but an incident of continuous life. Those qualities which we recognize to inhere particularly in the soul or spirit of man attend him to the world beyond. 'He that has been righteous, shall be righteous still; he that has been holy, shall be holy still.' And so with other qualities of man's inmost nature—love, justice, generosity—whatever he has had here, wherewith he can claim or offer to

[2] W. Bright, *ibid.* 137.

serve God, remains part of his personality, and finds its function in the life to come.

(2) *Rest.* Some people suppose that this life of service is only for the earth, and that it will be no longer required when we pass into the other life. Heaven is thought of by many as a place of absolute rest, where the inhabitants will have nothing more to do for ever. Indeed, in one of the beatitudes of the Book of Revelation we are told of the blessed dead that when they die in the Lord they rest from their labours. But the word 'labours' here does not mean things we do in love for our Master. It has in it the idea of painful toils, cares, anxieties, sufferings.

The deepest rest and the highest activity coincide. They do so in God who 'worketh hitherto' in undisturbed tranquillity; they may do so in us. The wheel that goes round in swiftest rotation seems to be standing still. Work at its intensest, which is pleasurable work, and level to the capacity of the doer, is the truest form of rest. In vacuity there are stings and torment; it is only in joyous activity which is not pushed to the extent of strain and unwelcome effort that the true rest of man is to be found. And the two verses in this Book of Revelation about this matter, which look at first sight to be opposed to each other, are like the two sides of a sphere, which unite and make the perfect whole. 'They rest from their labours.' 'They rest *not*, day nor night.'

(3) *Altruism.* Heaven's service must be service for other people. The law for heaven can surely not be more selfish than the law for earth, and that is, 'Whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all.' The law for the perfect man can surely not be different from the law for the Master, and the law for Him is, 'Even Christ pleased not himself.' The perfection of the child can surely not be different from the perfection of the Father, and the perfection of the Father is: 'He maketh his sun to "shine," and his blessings to come—on the unthankful and on the good.' So then the highest service for man is the service of others;—how, where, or whom, we cannot tell. We too may be 'ministering spirits, sent forth to minister' (He 1^{14}), but at all events not on ourselves can our activities centre; and not in self-culture can be the highest form of our service to God.

We often see the words 'Divine service will be conducted' at such an hour, by such and such a minister. And without detracting from the special status of the ministerial office, or the sanctity of the service of praise and prayer, when truly rendered to the King of Glory, we may still, with enlightened hearts, widen the scope of the phrase, and say, 'Divine service will be conducted' in this and that home, by the Christian serving-maid or the mother who lights the fire and prepares the breakfast, as the incarnate Minister did by the lake-side so sacredly. 'Divine service will be conducted' in this and that workshop, by such and such a carpenter, even as it was performed so sacredly at Nazareth. Or in this office and on that wharf, in this warehouse or behind that counter, in yonder palace in the great city, in this tiny cottage along the country lane, will divine service be conducted daily for the King of Glory, with vibrating thoughts of harmonious love for organ, and the seraphim, who cry, 'Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts,' for choir.[1]

II. They shall see His Face.

1. *They shall see.* In order that we may see there must be manifestation on the part of God, and there must be vision on the part of man.

(1) God has made four successive manifestations of Himself, of which this is the last and the highest. There is, first, the manifestation of God in His Word. In Ps 119^{130} a parallel is drawn between the sun shining upon and lighting the material world, and God shining upon and enlightening the spiritual world by the illumination of His Word: 'The entrance of thy words giveth light.' There is, secondly, the manifestation of God in the incarnation of the Son. 'We beheld his glory,' says St. John. We beheld His glory is the testimony of every one to whom Christ manifests Himself as He does not unto the world. There is, thirdly, the manifestation of God in the gift of the Spirit. 'The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us.' There is, fourthly, the manifestation in fulness when, with unveiled face, the redeemed see God and the Lamb sitting upon the throne. To Moses God said, 'Thou canst not see my face and live.' But to His disciples Jesus said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' Now, however, we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face. Happy he who shall—

Gaze one moment on the Face, whose beauty
  Wakes the world's great hymn;
Feel it one unutterable moment
  Bent in love o'er him;

[1] W. A. Cornaby, *In Touch with Reality*, 190.

In that look feel heaven, earth, men, and angels,
Distant grow and dim;
In that look feel heaven, earth, men, and angels,
Nearer grow through Him.[1]

(2) Man obtains three visions, of which this, again, is the last and the highest. First, he has the vision of *Righteousness*. Righteousness includes all those attributes which make up the idea of the Supreme Ruler of the universe—perfect justice, perfect truth, perfect purity, perfect moral harmony in all its aspects. It is related of Bishop Butler that in his last moments he expressed it as 'an awful thing to appear before the Moral Governor of the world.'[2] It is in moments of awe, when we commune with our own hearts and are still, that we have this vision. But the vision of Righteousness is succeeded by the vision of *Grace*. When Butler in his dying moments had expressed his awe at appearing face to face before the Moral Governor of the world, his chaplain, we are told, spoke to him of 'the blood which cleanseth from all sin.' 'Ah, this is comfortable,' he replied; and with these words on his lips he gave up his soul to God. He only, says Lightfoot, who has learned to feel the awe, will be taught to know the Grace. Then the vision of grace melts into the vision of *Glory*. This is the final stage in our progress. Not with transient gleam of radiance, as on the law-giver of old, shall the light be reflected from us; but, resting upon us with its own ineffable glory, the awful effluence—

Shall flood our being round, and take our lives
Into itself.

Oh, think! to step ashore, and that shore heaven;
To clasp a hand outstretched, and that God's hand;
To breathe new air, and that celestial air;
To feel refreshed and know it—immortality.
Oh, think! to pass from storm and stress
To one unbroken calm;
To wake and find it glory.

2. *His face.* Who's face? I, for my part, says Dr. Maclaren, do not believe that any conceivable extension of creatural faculties, or any conceivable hallowing of creatural natures, can make the creature able to gaze upon God. I know that it is often said that the joy of the future life for men is what the theologians call 'the beatific vision,' in which there shall be direct sight of God, using that word in its highest meaning, as applied to the perceptions of the spirit, and not of the sense. But I do not think the Bible teaches us that. It does teach us, 'We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.' But who is the 'Him'? Jesus Christ. And, in my belief, Jesus Christ will, to all eternity, be the medium of manifesting God, and there will remain, to all eternity, the incapacity which clogs creatures in time—No man hath seen God at any time, nor *can* see Him.

3. There are four striking passages which bring before our notice the face of Jesus. (1) Lk 9^{51}, 'He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem'; (2) Mt 26^{39}, 'He fell on his face and prayed'; (3) Mt 26^{67}, 'Then did they spit in his face'; (4) the present passage. St. John in his loneliness recalled the face of Jesus which had become familiar to him in three years of intimate fellowship. He recalled the face which expressed every variety of emotion that passed over His soul, now expressive of infinite tenderness as He had compassion on the multitude; now expressive of marvellous affection as He blessed the little children; now expressive of wonderful power as He commanded the winds and waves to obey Him; now expressive of truth as He taught His disciples; and now expressive of His divinity as He healed the sick and raised the dead. The beloved disciple had seen the face of Jesus when He walked upon the waves, when He subdued the storm, when He healed those possessed of divers diseases, when He taught the crowds that thronged about Him, when He was transfigured on the Mount, when He instituted the Lord's Supper, when He bore the cross, when He was crucified, when He gave the Great Commission, and ascended to glory; and now, on the Isle of Patmos, as a lonely exile, John recalled the face of Jesus that he had seen so oft and longed to see it again in its wisdom and love, majesty and power.

4. What was the appearance of His face on earth? Every artist in painting the portrait of Christ depicts Him with the face and figure of one of the nation to which the artist belongs. Thus the German paints Him as a German; the Frenchman as a Frenchman; the Italian as an Italian, and the American as an American. It teaches us the valuable lesson that Christ is the desire of all nations and offers Himself as the Saviour of all men. There were no paintings of the face of Jesus Christ and no description of His appear-

[1] Mrs. Rundle Charles, *Songs Old and New*, 59.
[2] Bartlett, *Memoirs of Bishop Butler*, 225.

ance left to the world—not a line to tell how the lowly Galilean looked when He walked amongst men. Was it because the disciples had forgotten how He appeared, or was it because they shrank from any material representation of Jesus, or was it because they never thought of Him after seeing Him glorified as the patient sufferer wandering upon the earth, or was the picture and description withheld for fear men would worship the seen, instead of the unseen, or was it because they had His presence with them, which no artist could paint, no pen describe?

It is an inspiration to see the face of a great man. Let it be announced that a King or a President is to appear, and excursions from afar bring thousands of people to the scene of his appearance that they may behold his face. Someone said it was worth crossing the ocean to see the face of Gladstone. When thinking of the departed ones we long to see their faces. We care but little about the texture of their glorified bodies, but we are anxious to see their dear, familiar, loving faces. The thought cheers and sustains us as we travel along the straight and narrow way that leads to eternal life, but there is a thought that is more cheerful, a desire more intense, a hope more elevating, an expectation more delightful—the seeing of our Saviour.

5. *What expression will His face wear then?* (1) It will wear a look of welcome; 'Come ye blessed of my Father.' (2) It will wear a look of love: 'Who loved me and gave himself for me.' (3) It will wear a look of content, for He shall have seen of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.

6. *And seeing His face they also shall be satisfied.* That may seem at first sight but a feeble presentation of the joy and the glories of life in heaven; but it contains, perhaps expresses, them all. To have a craving for love which only God can satisfy, and yet to be content; to have a desire for holiness not less than the holiness of God, and yet to be content; to have the infinite capacities of an eternal spirit set free from the trammels of earth, and yet to be content; to look back and see the meaning of it all; to look forward and know that time and change, grief and sin, are for ever left behind—is not that a heaven, one worth waiting for, one worth living for? 'I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness,' said the Psalmist; and when we ponder his words, we see that human language can express no higher bliss: 'I shall be satisfied.'

Throughout the long Christian ages, this hope of 'the beatific Vision,' of that Sight of the Lord which makes absolutely blessed, has shone before the eyes of the Church on her pilgrimage, as the ultimate rest and glory. So it must be. Heaven is to be the scene of an endless life. The prospect, apart from the sight of God, would be even terrible; it would more than realize the sorrowful Tithonus-legend of the Greeks, the woe of the being who, asking for immortality, forgot to ask also for immortal youth. Nothing but the Vision can keep the finite creature new and young for ever. But that can; each for himself, all for one another, and for the Lord, the blessed shall be for ever crowned with an unfading, yea, a blossoming life, seeing Him.'

It is told of an ancient sculptor's statue of the goddess of Love, that, if a riband was drawn over its eyes, the face had no charm, but when the riband was removed, it was lit with beauty like a landscape when the morning breaks. And how beautiful the Face of Jesus must have been in the Light of that Surpassing Love which shone through the windows of His soul! Though His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men, yet He would be the chiefest among ten thousand, altogether lovely.[1]

7. *They shall serve and they shall see.* These two, the life of work and the life of devout communion—the Martha and the Mary of the Christian experience—are antagonistic here below, and it is hard to reconcile their conflicting, fluctuating claims and to know how much to give to the inward life of gazing upon Christ, and how much to the outward life of serving Him. But, says the text, the two shall be blended together. 'His servants shall serve him;' nor in all their activity shall they lose the vision of His face. His servants 'shall see his face'; nor in all the still blessedness of their gaze upon Him shall they slack the diligence of the unwearied hands, or the speed of the willing feet. The Rabbis taught that there were angels who serve, and angels who praise, but the two classes meet in the perfected man, whose service shall be praise, whose praise shall be service.

The words, 'they shall see his face' suggest that this will be the inspiration of the heavenly service. We know what a benediction the face of a loved and honoured human friend is to us as we go out on any hard task or dangerous duty. There are men whose 'God bless you' makes us braver and stronger for days. One said, speaking of a dear and noble friend, 'To meet him in the morning and have his smile brightens all the hours of the day for me.' What will it be in heaven to look into Christ's face of love in the morning and to have His smile!

[1] D. Smith, *The Face of Jesus*, p. 26.

We know not when, we know not where,
We know not what that world will be;
But this we know—it will be fair
To see.

With heart athirst and thirsty face,
We know and know not what shall be:—
Christ Jesus brings us of His grace
To see.

Christ Jesus brings us of His grace,
Beyond all prayers our hope can pray,
One day to see Him face to face,—
One day.[1]

III. His Name shall be on their Foreheads.

1. The forehead is in itself an inscription; it is the mark of Man. For no other creature bears the smooth-domed architrave and *metopon* over the portal of its communication with the world. The birds, with their swiftness and airiness of motion, lack the forehead altogether; and the beasts, notwithstanding broad and heavy frontlets, designed, as it were, to push and thrust through the jungle or against the foe, have not the arched dome on which a name might be written. When there is the lofty dome of Shakespeare or of Sir Walter Scott, or 'the bar of Michael Angelo,' we estimate the genius which resides and works within by the stately span of the arched building. But even the humblest human brow is far removed from that of the noblest ape; on the ape's brow nothing can be written, but on the man's is at least written this: that he is a Man. It is this meaning and mark of the forehead which gives the imaginative glory to Milton's figure, when he says that the Star

Flames in the forehead of the morning sky.

I had another conversation last night. The birds have come back again; and I asked the robins what their idea was, anyhow, of going south every autumn. I had noticed their cessation of singing and their discernment of the weather, and their collection in mute flocks, and finally their sailing in the night on uplifted wing, in an unknown way, to a far distant summer. They were travellers and explorers; and I told them of Humboldt, who had circumnavigated the globe and dwelt in all the sunny spots of South America and the tropics. I explained to them why he travelled and what knowledge he collected. The only answer which I got from my robins was, 'Have you any little crumbs of bread handy that we can eat? As to travelling, we travel; but all the rest that you have been telling us of—trees, plants, astronomy, geology, etc.—we would rather have a crumb of bread than to know about these.' It was not my fault that I could not make the robins understand what scientific travelling is; it was because they were robins, and not men. They were not big enough.[2]

2. Dr. Selwyn notices three stages of thought in the Apocalypse in reference to the forehead. (1) The servants of God are sealed on their foreheads (7^3). (2) The name of the Lamb upon their foreheads (with no verb at all, 22^4). (3) His name and His Father's written upon their foreheads (14^1). After which comes 3^{12}, adding 'the name of the city.[3]

3. What does the name on the forehead signify?

(1) *Ownership*. The face of God seems always to represent the revelation of Him by vision, and His name the revelation of Him by testimony. In our text, those who see His face are represented as bearing His impress, and carrying the sign of ownership upon their foreheads. The forehead is that part of the face expressive of strength. Under the old dispensation a frontlet was worn upon the forehead as well as upon the left arm. The frontlet upon the left arm was tied with a thong that was wound around the arm until it reached the tip of the longest finger. This seemed to indicate that the power of service on the part of the individual was consecrated. The frontlet placed between the eyes on the forehead, on the contrary, was intended to express the fact that the whole intelligence of the man was consecrated to God. Thus John, having already referred to the service rendered, now speaks of the impress of divine ownership which the noblest feature of man shall bear—'His name shall be upon their foreheads.' Yea, further, as the plate upon Aaron's forehead had the words written on it, 'Holy is the Lord,' so shall those who were once God's servants become His temple priests, and, seeing His face, shall also wear upon their foreheads the name of their God, and thus bear silent but eloquent and everlasting witness that they are His.

It is only the *name* that is written on the perfected saint's forehead. Not the 'Holiness unto the Lord,' but just the bare name. What does that mean? Well, it means the same as your writing your name in one of your books does,

[1] Christina G. Rossetti.

[2] H. Ward Beecher in *Christian World Pulpit*, ix. 284.

[3] E. C. Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets*, 189.

or as when a man puts his initials on the back of his oxen, or as the old practice of branding the master's mark upon the slave did. It means absolute ownership.

We think of the brand of slavery, the inscription of the owner's name upon the body of the slave. We recall how the most spiritual and imaginative of the Old Testament prophets had already idealized this immemorial usage to set forth the willing subjection of the surrounding nations to the God of Israel, in the words: 'One shall say, "I am Jehovah's," and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob, and another shall write on his hand, "Jehovah's"' (Is 44^5 margin). And now at last the seer of Patmos, beholding in prospect the final regeneration and renewal of mankind, embraces in a single apocalyptic glance the whole evolution of human society, from the rudest beginnings of barbaric slavery to the joyful services of the new heavens and the new earth, where the servants are still slaves and yet 'kings and priests unto God.'

(2) *Likeness.* But it means more than ownership. The name is the manifested personality, the revealed God, or, as we say in an abstract way, the character of God. That name is to be on the foreheads of His perfected people. How does it come to be there? Read the clause before. 'His servants shall see his face, and his name shall be on their foreheads.' That is to say, the perfected condition is not reached by surrender only, but by assimilation; and that assimilation comes by contemplation. The faces that are turned to Him, and behold Him, are smitten with the light and shine, and those that look upon them see 'as it had been the face of an angel,' as the Sanhedrin saw that of Stephen, when he beheld the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God.

'There are lots o' men in this world, Jemima, and still more women, who grow old before their time working for other people: and I take it that when folks talk o' their wrinkles, the Lord says, "My name shall be on their foreheads"; and when folks talk o' their grey hairs, He says, "They shall walk with Me in white for they are worthy."'[1]

FitzGerald one day went with Tennyson to an art gallery. In it they found a long line of marble busts. Side by side were busts of Dante and Goethe. The poet and his friend studied with interest, and in silence, the two faces. At last FitzGerald broke the silence with a question. He asked Tennyson, 'What is it which is present in Dante's face and absent in Goethe's face?' The poet answered, 'The divine.'

[1] Ellen Thorneycroft Fowler in *The Farringdons*.

(3) *Holiness* or *Sanctification.* In a band of gold that encircled the forehead of the high priest of the Jewish temple, there was engraven 'Holiness unto the Lord.' This marked the man who alone might ever enter that holiest room of all, which represented heaven. That real character distinguishes the Son of God, who is the High Priest of the Church over which Christ presides. The like name denotes the like character of His people in heaven. This challenge, as if it said 'Who goes there?' is heard in respect of each and every one who approaches the gates of the New Jerusalem. 'There shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth.' Defilement is inability to see God. It is as the cataract in the eye. Purity of heart is the lens through which alone God is seen. But 'holiness to the Lord' shall then be a fact for each one of the redeemed. The promise is thus seen fulfilled, at the end of this Book of the Revelation, which is given to God's children in the beginning of it. 'Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God; and I will write upon him my New Name' (Rev 3^{12}).

A man once said to me, 'You carry a certificate of health in your face.' He was speaking of physical health. But it struck me at the time, and it strikes me still, that, all unconsciously to himself, he was illustrating by a happy metaphor the meaning of this passage. St. John says that in the New Jerusalem the spiritual health of men will be so good that they will carry a certificate of it in their face, or, as he puts it, on their forehead. The idea, of course, is that their Christian character will show itself in the very front of their lives, that it will be patent to the observation of every man. Now, in the old Jerusalem this cannot always be said of either physical or spiritual health. Many people look delicate who are inwardly strong; they have health, but they do not carry it on their foreheads. In like manner many people look frivolous who are very serious. In a recent book a minister tells us how he had received a letter breathing the intensity of religious emotion from a lady of his congregation whom, to meet in society, he would deem the gayest of the gay, and whom he would believe to be not at all interested in spiritual things. I would say this woman had the name of Christ in her heart, but not on her forehead. In the New Jerusalem, however, St. John declares that there will be no difference between appearance and reality; men and women will look what they are, and be what they look.[2]

[2] G. Matheson, *Messages of Hope*, 245.

A little girl reading this phrase, asked her father, 'Who will write it?' The father replied, 'It will write itself, Mabel. Look at your dear grandfather and see how contented and smooth his face is. The name of the Lord is already written on his forehead. When you are angry next time, run and look at yourself in the glass. You will see that your forehead is wrinkled and cross. If you want the name of God on your forehead, you must live a contented and holy life, like your grandfather, in all things doing God's will.'

(*a*) The secret of true holiness is *unconsciousness of itself.* Unconsciousness of the radiance on the face is part of the splendour; being aware of it would dim the brightness. We know that when any one is conscious of the beauty or the refinement stamped on his face, a great part of the beauty or the refinement is gone. So self-consciousness mars spiritual loveliness. When a man knows that he is humble, he is no longer humble. The name will be visible to all who look upon them, but will be unseen by themselves. That they are Christ's is evident to all, but of this they themselves are unconscious.'

There is a beautiful legend which tells of a saintly man who was greatly beloved of the angels, who had seen much of his godly life on the earth. The angels asked God to give their favourite some new power, some fresh mark of the Divine favour, some new gift or ability, which would make him still more useful. They were told to see the man and ask him what special power he would like to have bestowed upon him. The angels visited him and asked him what gift he would choose. He said he was content and wanted nothing more. They pressed him to name something which God might do for him or give to him. Would he not like power to work miracles? He said No—that was Christ's work. Would he not like power to lead many souls to Christ? He answered No—it was the Holy Spirit's work to lead men to the Saviour. The angels in their eagerness still begged him to name something which they might ask God to grant to him. At last he answered that if he must choose any new power he would like the ability to do a great deal of good among men without even knowing it. So it was granted that from that day his shadow, when it fell behind him where he could not see it, had wondrous healing power, but when it fell before his face where he could see it, it had no such power.[1]

(*b*) The interest of true holiness is its *unending variety.* The multitude no man can number. But it is no mere mass, no mere aggregated unit. It is a host of faces. Look, the very foreheads are to be seen; each forehead there, as it is here, the seat and the expression of personal character, of individual thought, and will, and affection; no two precisely alike there, any more than here, while all are suffused with the inner oneness of the family of God. Each happy personality, while one with Him, and in Him one with all, is *itself* for all eternity, sustained by Him unwearied in its blissful identity, and so contributing *itself* that individual radiating point of life and love, to the joy of all.

In this enduring individuality of the glorified may we not trace a deep assurance that they shall always enjoy a deep felicity in *each other*? This indeed shall never be their supreme felicity, but it shall always be a real one. Never shall they find in each other the *spring* of life and love; but consciously, and with *mutual* delight, they shall rejoice together in Him who is the spring. 'His name on their foreheads' shall renew in them for ever a youth of holy companionship; they shall be never weary of each other, because they shall all be for ever those who 'see the face' of their Friend and Lord.

I saw a Saint.—How canst thou tell that he
Thou sawest was a Saint?—
I saw one like to Christ so luminously
By patient deeds of love, his mortal taint
Seemed made his groundwork for humility.

And when he marked me downcast utterly
Where foul I sat and faint,
Then more than ever Christ-like kindled he;
And welcomed me as I had been a saint,
Tenderly stooping low to comfort me.

Christ bade him, 'Do thou likewise.' Wherefore he
Waxed zealous to acquaint
His soul with sin and sorrow, if so be
He might retrieve some latent saint:—
'Lo, I, with the child God hath given to me!'[2]

Literature.—H. W. Beecher in *Christian World Pulpit*, ix. 282; J. L. Brandt, *Soul Saving*, 77; W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, 130; W. A. Cornaby, *In Touch with Reality*, 180; D. Davies, *Talks with Men, Women, and Children*, 107; R. F. Horton in *The Christian World*, March 24, 1910; J. B. Lightfoot, *Leaders in the Northern Church*, 161; T. F. Lockyer, *The Inspirations of the Christian Life*, 232; J. F. M'Curdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, 49; A. Maclaren, *Expositions of Holy Scripture, Isaiah i.–xlviii.* 30; *The Beatitudes*, 272; *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser., 125; G. Matheson, *Messages of Hope*, 245; J. R. Miller, *Our New Edens*, 103; H. C. G. Moule, *From Sunday to Sunday*, 296; *Christ is All*, 203; A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, ix. 305; C. A. Scott, *The Book of the Revelation*, 303; D. Smith, *The Face of Jesus*, 36; C. H. Spurgeon, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, 1576; H. Stevens, *Sermon Outlines*, 106.

[1] J. R. Miller, *Our New Edens*, 116.

[2] C. G. Rossetti, *The Face of the Deep*, 169.

The Use of Charms and Amulets in Ethiopia.

By Rev. G. Margoliouth, M.A., of the British Museum.

In dealing with Ethiopic charms and amulets, it is necessary to remember that the Christian population of Abyssinia, which is strongest in the north, and with whom Ethiopic ranks as the sacred and classical language, has throughout its history remained in close contiguity with the pagan races belonging partly to African aboriginal nationalities and partly to the Hamitic or Cushite tribes who settled there in the remote past, long before the Semites, from whom the main stock of the Christian communities is drawn, obtained a footing in the country.[1] It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that we are here confronted with a veritable medley of notions and practices. Superstitious pagan rites have been taken over bodily into the popular Christian customs; purely Christian ordinances have to a certain extent been degraded from the high spiritual inwardness, on which their true value depends, into something like talismanic signs and symbols; and—what is more commonly the case—Christian and pagan practices have in the popular mind been mixed up in a manner which to us seems startling and confusing. All these combinations of customs and ideas are well illustrated in Ethiopic charms in general and the species of charms known as amulets in particular.

1. Charms.—A striking instance of borrowing from pagan religion is the use made of the 'ghost-tree' for the purpose of driving out all sorts of demons, the desired effect being produced by the burning of a root or branch of the tree.[2] Other examples of what appear to be purely pagan charms are certain herbs worn as a protection against hydrophobia, the application of shreds of blue paper to counteract headache,[3] models of hostile ships or soldiers maltreated or destroyed for the purpose of bringing about the destruction of the real enemy and his fleet.[4] As an instance of a spell employed by an evil spirit against human beings may be mentioned the muttering into a particular kind of straw selected by the demon named Bouda, in his malignant designs on his intended victim. The straw is then bent into a circle and placed under a stone, whereupon the person marked out for harm is taken ill. If the straw snaps, the patient dies.[5]

Very great importance is attached in magic spells to the knowledge of names and of the power residing in them; and in this potent element of the magician's art Jewish, Christian, and pagan ideas curiously meet. It is well known that in primitive times the use of a name was considered to involve the person or thing bearing the same. In genuine Christian belief the efficacy of pronouncing a holy name, of course, depended on the inward spiritual realization of the power thus invoked; but in Abyssinia, Biblical sacred names, together with a large number of fanciful appellations much resembling those in the Jewish Kabbala, were magically pronounced for the purpose of warding off the power of demons and all kinds of diseases. A good exemplification of this use of names is found in the book *Arde'et*, or 'Disciples,' probably composed between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries.[6]

Another curious case in which various elements meet is the belief that special magical powers reside in the persons of Jewish blacksmiths, who, amongst other things, are held to possess the power of changing the shape of a person into any other form they please. The blacksmith lies under suspicion on account of his being a worker in metals,[7]—an occupation which has in various parts been associated with magic, and is probably also ultimately connected with one aspect of the history of Cain, whose name is by several scholars

[1] For an account of the races and religions of Abyssinia, see art. 'Abyssinia' in vol. i. of Hastings' *Encyc. of Religion and Ethics*.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 56, 58.

[3] Harris, *Highlands of Ethiopia*, 1844, ii. 158. A dim notion of medical properties may possibly lurk in this use of herbs and blue paper.

[4] Budge, *Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great*, 1896, ii. 4–5.

[5] Parkyns, *Life in Abyssinia*, 1868, ii. 146.

[6] See Littmann's ed. in *J.A.O.S.*, vol. xxv. 1st half, pp. 1–48.

[7] Perhaps not only because the power of melting metals was ascribed to demons (Budge, *Lady Meux's MSS*, Nos. 2–5, p. li), but also because subterraneous operations are required in order to obtain the metals. It should also be noted that the profession of a blacksmith is hereditary in Abyssinia.

taken to mean 'smith,' or artificer in metals. The fear inspired by the Jewish element is apparently due to the opposition on the part of the Christians to the Falashas or Abyssinian Jews. Anyhow, the power of the spell here derives its efficacy from the occupation and race of those who exercise it.

This part of the subject may fitly be closed by a reference to the exorcism of *Bouda* (a kind of possession to which *Zar* [= *Tigritiya*?][1] is very similar). In the account given by Stern (*Wanderings among the Falashas*, 1862, p. 154), the exorcist with one hand laid an amulet on the heaving bosom of the suffering woman, whilst with the other he made her smell a rag in which the root of a strong-scented plant (ghost-tree?), the bone of a hyæna (specially intended to counteract the hyæna-like character of the possession), and some other things were bound up. He then asked the name of the demon (which, by the way, is always masculine, the person possessed being generally feminine), and finally concluded with Christian invocations, ending with the 318 bishops who attended the Council of Nicæa. The demon, however, only gradually left his victim. He had, indeed, to be considerably coaxed and fed before he finally consented to depart. Modern travellers agree that a good deal of shamming is practised in these cases of possession, but the shamming itself is a testimony to the hold which the superstition has upon the popular mind.[2]

2. **Amulets.**—All the Ethiopic amulets so far brought to Europe are externally very much like one another, differing only in size, and for the most part belong to the eighteenth century or thereabouts. They consist of slips of parchment, narrow as a rule, and more or less carefully sewn together. When completed, they are tightly rolled up and generally placed in leather receptacles, which, by means of straps, are hung round the neck or attached to another part of the body. They are also often fixed on the wall of a room belonging to a woman in expectation of confinement. It is essential that the name of the person to be protected by the amulet should be embodied in the prayers contained in it.

When opened out, an amulet is generally found to contain on the top a coloured design, more or less crude, of the archangel Michael, an ornamented cross, or some other figure. At the bottom are sometimes found rectangular or other designs, with eyes numbering two or more. Similar emblematic figures are also frequently found in the middle, and, in the case of longer amulets, at certain intervals throughout the scroll. Littmann considers that the eyes are intended to symbolize the 'evil eye' ('Princeton Ethiopic Magic Scroll,' p. 32, in *Princeton Coll. Bulletin*, xv.), but it is quite as likely that the healing power of the Divine eye is here represented.[3] Another favourite design is a picture representing the fight between Sūsenyōs and Werzelyā (see below). The serpent, the fish, and other animal forms also, though rather rarely, occur.

The contents of an amulet (the Ethiopic being often mixed with some Amharic) consist of invocations of curiously formed angelic names, scraps of genuine Christian devotion, and legendary narratives compounded mainly of Jewish and Christian elements, but permeated by magic, and therefore heathen, notions. They are expressly stated to be preservatives against various diseases, such as fever, colic, and sickness; against demons of divers kinds who have power to injure infants as well as adult persons; against the evil eye, and other malevolent powers and influences.

A narrative found in the majority of the scrolls is that of Sūsenyōs and Werzelyā. The story is briefly as follows:—

A man named Sūsenyōs married a wife. When their first child was born, a female demon bearing the name of Werzelyā entered the house and killed the infant. On hearing this, Sūsenyōs mounted his horse, took his lance, and went forth to seek Werzelyā. He succeeded in overcoming the demon, who since that time lost the power of doing harm to any child where the names of Sūsenyōs and of his heavenly protectors are pronounced.

The forms of the story differ considerably in different scrolls.[4] According to some, Werzelyā is actually killed by Sūsenyōs; but the version above stated seems to be the more original one; for, if Werzelyā had been killed, there would

[1] The identification of *Zar* with *Tigritiya* appears to follow from a comparison of Stern's narrative with those of other travellers.

[2] There are, however, sufficient indications to show that in modern Abyssinia the appliances of medical art introduced from Europe are on the way towards displacing cures by magic.

[3] Compare the 'eye of Osiris' as a protection against the evil eye (F. T. Elworthy, *The Evil Eye*, 1895, p. 126). Littmann lays stress on the black colour of the eye depicted, but he points out in a note that, according to Dr. J. P. Peters, 'the light, particularly the blue, eye is the most dangerous in Syria and Mesopotamia.'

[4] See W. H. Worrell, 'Studien z. abessin. Zauberwesen,' in *Z.A.* xxiii. 166.

have been no need for amulets as a protection against her destructive power.[1]

The original Sūsenyōs is identified by Littmann ('Princeton Ethiopic Magic Scroll,' p. 41) with the martyr of that name found in the Ethiopic *Synaxarium* (see also Basset, *Les Apocr. Ethiopiens*, iv. 10). According to the account there given, Sūsenyōs lived in the time of Diocletian, and he is reported to have killed in Antioch his sister, who had caused the death of her daughter, and had had a son by Satan. In one of the MSS used by K. Fries ('The Ethiopic Legend of Socinius and Ursula,' in the *Transactions of the Congress of Orientalists*, held at Leyden in 1893), the sister of the Sūsenyōs in the *Synaxarium* is actually called Werzelyā. In the corresponding Greek and Slavonic legends her name is, however, Melintha (see M. Caster, *Folklore*, xi. 126 ff.); and there can be no doubt that Werzelyā in the amulet legend is the Ethiopic[2] Lilith, who plays among the Semites the same part as Lamia among the Greeks.

Another element which—as may be expected—is not unfrequently referred to in the magic scrolls is the power of King Solomon over demons, and there are also a number of other traits of a more or less significant character.

The largest number of topics embodied in Ethiopic amulets so far published is found in Budge's edition of *Lady Meux's MSS*, Nos. 2–5. Omitting the story of Sūsenyōs and Werzelyā, which is of course also found there, these topics may be briefly summarized as follows:—(1) The story of a woman fiend whom our Lord and His disciples met in the neighbourhood of Tiberias, and who had the power to destroy travellers and children, and to do other kinds of mischief. By our Lord's command she was burnt, and her ashes were scattered to the four winds of heaven. Here we clearly have an element akin to that of Werzelyā. (2) A piece of rare occurrence is a prayer ascribed to the Prophet Jeremiah, who was by the gift of prophecy enabled to declare the power of the cross of Christ. (3) A conversation between King Solomon and the children of Kedar, who were workers in metal, devoured the flesh of men, and did other fearful things. Solomon obtains their secret, and overcomes them by the power of a series of Divine names specially revealed to him. (4) One of the amulets contains a reference to the 'twenty-seven lamps which were given to Enoch.' (5) In another amulet reference is made to Enoch, Elijah, Nabal, who opposed David, Uzza, who dared to look into the ark, and to the magical names which God gave to Moses. (6) A subject which appears to have been purposely embodied in order to lead the owner in a more decidedly Christian direction is found in the British Museum MS. Or. 4716 (Budge, p. lxi). It is a kind of litany, beginning with the invocation of the Holy Trinity, and then proceeding with addresses to Christ, in which a number of the events of His life are enumerated. The evils to be warded off are the tongue of the demon Bāryā, the tongues of men both of kinsfolk and strangers, fever, rheumatism, and other diseases.

[1] Unless the idea is that the death of Werzelyā only signifies the separation of her spirit from the body she was inhabiting.

[2] As for the origin of the name *Werzelyā*, Littmann thinks it probable that it is Cushite. Dr. Fries identified it with the Latin *Ursula*, but Basset has (probably with justice) pronounced against this.

Mercy and Truth.

By the Ven. G. R. Wynne, D.D., Archdeacon of Aghadoe, and Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin.

Two verses in St. Paul's writings which throw some light on each other seem to have been imperfectly understood by the translators of the A.V., and one of them scarcely better comprehended by the Revisers. They are Eph 2^{17} and Ro 15^{9}. The A.V. in the former case reads, 'He came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.' The entire concealment of the second 'peace' of the Greek text is here not easily explicable. (Luther's version similarly suppresses the second 'peace'). The Vulgate brings out the sense exactly, 'Evangelizavit pacem vobis, qui longe fuistis, et pacem iis, qui prope.' The Revised Version, similarly, has, 'preached peace to you who were afar off, and peace to them that were nigh.' The repetition of the word *peace*, producing, as it does, an emphatic but rather rough sentence, must have been intended by the writer to call attention to some difference, such as in the form, the source, or the conditions of the gift, if

not of its intrinsic character; or at least to indicate that the two classes, Jew and Gentile, were not simply joint recipients of one and the same thing at one and the same time. The fact that the gift is the same but the giving is duplicated makes us ask what is the difference suggested? If I say, 'He gave sapphires to his daughter Mary, and sapphires to his daughter Martha,' I am necessarily driven to ask, Why not say, 'He gave sapphires to his two daughters'?

There is no difference in the ultimate results, for we read in the context, 'He hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, so making peace.' The inference from the rather peculiar and unique form of sentence seems to be that St. Paul sees a reason for distinguishing the giving while not distinguishing the gift. Now, in what way does he suggest a distinction?

The explanation of his words must be supplied either by our general sense of probability, by the analogy of other scriptures, or it may be found in some other reference by the same writer, if such exist, to the subject in hand. If he has in mind some important distinction which drives him to vary from the obvious and simple form as expressed in the (erroneous) A.V., 'He came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh,' it may be that we shall find him referring to the subject in a clearer manner somewhere else in his writings. And this he has done in the second passage referred to at the beginning of this article. The reference is to Ro 15^{9}. This passage seems also not to have been generally understood; and among those who have not grasped the meaning intended by the Apostle must be placed the translators of the A.V., and, strangely, of the R.V. also. I give first the Greek and Vulgate. Λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγονῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται, κ.τ.λ.

Vulgate: 'Dico enim Christum Jesum ministrum fuisse circumcisionis propter veritatem Dei ad confirmandas promissiones patrum; Gentes autem super misericordia honorare Deum, sicut scriptum est . . .' When we study these two together, we can find no fault whatever in the Latin rendering, which observes the niceties of the verse, quite lost in the A.V. The purpose of the Apostolic writer is to make a vigorous contrast between the manner in which the Jew and the Gentile came into the full enjoyment of the peace of God, or of His salvation. The contrast is made by three means:

(1) By the use of the adversative or distinctive particle δὲ, 'but.' (2) By placing the subject or ground of the glorying of the Gentiles in the prominent position in the sentence, before the mention of the glorying itself; and (3), by the placing of the word 'mercy' absolutely, and without a possessive pronoun to slightly diminish its striking force. Each of these methods of distinction is reproduced by the Vulgate, *each is missed by the Authorized Version.* We have 'Gentes autem' for τὰ δὲ ἔθνη, and 'super misericordia honorare Deum' for ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν. It will be seen readily, when once attention is called to the matter, that the writer is doing his best to draw a clear distinction between the grounds on which the two parties obtained the inheritance of God's salvation or peace. (The Jew on account of primeval promise, the Gentile from pure mercy.) But all three—(1) the use of *but*; (2) the place of the words, 'for (his) mercy'; (3) the use of 'mercy' absolutely, and without a possessive—are missed by our translators. They have not had their minds arrested by any of the marks of contrast, and so they translate very weakly, as if it was simply a statement that the Gentiles come in with the circumcision for all these blessings; and if you read the English sentence and add to it at the end a few words: 'And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy, *as well as the Jews*,' you have a clear grasp of what the *translators* thought the sentence to mean. They thought that the Gentiles were to share with the Jews in thanking God for one and the same mercy. But this is precisely what the Apostle did *not* mean. The Vulgate clears up the matter, though the Greek is so simple that it really needs no clearing up, 'Gentes *autem* super *misericordia* honorare Deum.' '*But* the Gentiles for *mercy* should honour God.' (Observe the three points in which the Vulgate and A.V. differ.) The accent is strongly thrown on MERCY, as a ground of blessing in some way different from that provided for the Jew.

One certainly expected to find a correction of these three mistakes in the Revised Version; but strangely enough, the words are identical in the two translations. The Revisers have not taken any notice. The contrast is missed in all three

points, and so we again have: 'And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy,' instead of '*But* that the Gentiles, on account of *mercy*, should glorify God.'

The public reader, at the desk or lectern, can in part correct and interpret by rightly placing his emphasis and reading the whole text as if the words TRUTH and PROMISES had been printed in larger type in the first part, and MERCY in the second. He can go further, as the present writer does, and substitute 'but' for 'and,' as well as missing out the word 'his.'

And now we find ourselves led back to the text in Ephesians which started this discussion, and which is illuminated, and provided with justification from St. Paul's habit of thought, by being brought into touch with the verses in Romans. The two passages combine in assuring the gift of God's peace to both Jew and Gentile, but with a difference, not in the ultimate result, but in the method and ground in the character of God. Peace is for the circumcision—(mark the word, which points more than the word 'Jew' would have done, to the ancient covenant)—in performance of an old promise of God, for the glorification of His *Truth*; peace is for the Gentile, uncovenanted, in the splendid exercise of His *Mercy*.

Thus 'Mercy and Truth have met together'; issuing, each of them in the making and preaching and bringing of Peace to those who, the one in the covenant of promise, the other without, so sorely needed that He should come to the rescue—He, who is our Peace, and who, 'veniens, evangelizavit pacem vobis, qui longe fuistis, et pacem iis, qui prope.' And all is wound up by the happy assurance, 'Quoniam per Ipsum habemus accessum ambo in uno Spiritu ad Patrem.'

Literature.

CHRIST AND CIVILIZATION.

A VOLUME with the title of *Christ and Civilization* has been edited for the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches by the Rev. John Brown Paton, D.D., Sir Percy William Bunting, M.A., and the Rev. Alfred Ernest Garvie, D.D., and may be had at the Memorial Hall, E.C. (10s. 6d. net). It is a handsome imposing volume of 550 pages. It contains twelve essays by twelve separate men belonging to the Free Churches, each of them chosen because he has studied some particular part of the history of the Christian Church and made himself master of it. The twelve essays together form a survey in historical order of the influence of the Christian religion upon the course of civilization.

The first essay is introductory. Its author is the Rev. John Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D., Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, and ex-President of the National Free Church Council. Dr. Scott Lidgett tells us what the modern social problem is, where to look for the solution of it, and what is the peculiar responsibility of the Christian Church in the presence of it. He finds the modern social problem in the city slum. Of course it is not altogether there. The problem of the city slum is largely due to density of population. But there is a real problem due to sparsity of population. The crofter in some parts of Scotland has an existence of toil and hardship, for which he will never find the slum-dweller willing to barter with him. And again, in some parts of the country, where the 'bothy' system prevails, morality is more difficult than in the one-roomed dwellings of a congested city district. But Dr. Scott Lidgett knows only the city problem; and it is enough. In what direction, then, does he look for a solution of the problem of the slum?

Not in the direction of commercialism, and not in the direction of politics. He looks to brotherly co-operation and brotherly sacrifice on the part of the more fortunate. For the modern social problem, he says, is above all spiritual. In saying which, he at once strikes the keynote of the volume, and affirms the very purpose for which it has been written. But observe that Dr. Scott Lidgett does not look to the Church. He does not look to any Church, free or bond. It is there that we find the chief significance of the volume. We have had many books in recent years on the relation of the Church to the social problem. But what have they

signified? They have made it manifest that their authors were much more interested in the Church than in the social question, their concern being not that there were crowded slums, but that there were empty churches. It may be true, we believe it is true, that our social sores will never be healed by anti-Christian philanthropy, or even apart from the Church of Christ. But it is quite certain that before the healing comes, the Church of Christ must see that the social sore is not the empty church, but the crowded slum.

In the second essay Professor W. H. Bennett begins the history of the relation of Christianity to social life with a study of the Social Ideals of the Old Testament. He is able to start at once at the place where Dr. Scott Lidgett leaves off. For the social life of the Israelite was a religious life. Its only defect was in practice. The protests of the prophets against the oppression of the poor were protests against apostasy. God was on the side, not of the big battalions, but of the poor and the needy.

Then comes Dr. Garvie's article. Its title is 'The Christian Ideal revealed in Jesus.' To Dr. Garvie, therefore, has been assigned the central article of the series, and the most difficult. Nor can it be said that the difficulty of describing Jesus' teaching on social responsibility is lessened by the vast amount of writing upon it of recent years. Dr. Garvie does wisely in making no reference to that writing, except in one case, which he could easily have omitted also. His method is clear and progressive and very convincing. He finds that the heart of the Christian gospel is the confession and invitation of Mt $11^{25\text{-}30}$. It is 'the only begotten Son,' who says 'come unto me.' The realization of the promised rest is hindered by sin, which Jesus has come to remove. That, then, is the first thing. But the central thought of Jesus is rest for the weary. And that is His central action, to remove the hindrances to it, all of which He sums up in the one word 'sin.' But this priceless gift involves a correspondent moral duty. To whom much is forgiven, the same loveth much. And this responsive love is to be (1) impartial, (2) universal, (3) practical, and its practical energy will be exercised in avoiding injury quite as much as in giving help. Then Dr. Garvie prepares the way for the subsequent articles in the volume by pointing out that for the purpose of carrying out these principles of conduct, or doing His commandments, as He expresses it, Jesus formed His followers into a society, instituted certain simple ordinances, and gave them the new commandment of love to one another as their bond of liberty.

It is now enough to name the rest of the articles. Mr. Franklin Angus, Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, writes on 'The Preparation for the Christian Ideal in the Gentile Environment of the Primitive Church,' and Professor Vernon Bartlet on 'The Christian Ideal as realized in the Primitive Church.' Professor Orr gives an account of 'The Factors in the Expansion of the Christian Church'; Professor Scullard, of New College, London, traces 'The Influence of the Christian Church upon the Roman Empire,' and Principal Workman traces 'The Social and Ethical Development of the Middle Ages.' The article on 'The Reformation: Its Social Principles and Effects,' has been assigned to Professor Andrews; that on 'The Evangelical Revival' to Professor T. C. Hall of Union Theological Seminary, New York. Mr. J. Holland Rose, Litt.D., the author of *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era*, writes the article on 'Christianity and the French Revolution.' The eleventh essay, on 'The Social Influence of Christianity as illustrated by Modern Foreign Missions,' has been written by the Rev. James S. Dennis, D.D., the author of *Christian Missions and Social Progress*. The twelfth and last article is entitled 'Modern Scientific and Philosophic Thought regarding Human Society'; the author is Professor Henry Jones of the University of Glasgow.

The volume is the weightiest contribution to the literature of the social problem on its Christian side that has yet been made in this country.

THE QUEST OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS.

There was a time when any one, with a Harmony and a little literary ability, could write a Life of Christ. Now there is no task that demands more specializing. In 1906 Albert Schweitzer, Privatdozent in New Testament Studies in the University of Strassburg, published an immense volume entitled *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. This volume has now been translated, under the title of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Pro-*

gress from Reimarus to Wrede (A. & C. Black). And now, even the reader of English can see for himself how multitudinous are the problems that arise in the study of the life of Jesus, and how very difficult many of these problems are. Some of them have been in existence for a long time. Reimarus died in 1768. But their number has enormously increased within quite recent years. And it is no longer possible for the historian of the life of Christ to ignore them.

This is the great change. More of the difficulties in the Gospels were known to men like Farrar and Edersheim than we realize as we read their pleasant pages. But they could pass them by; or they could adopt the first serviceable explanation of them. Now the difficulties have to be discussed, and sometimes the admission has at last to be made that no explanation has been found yet.

Schweitzer himself, who is not an extreme critic, often declares that he is baffled. Take, for example, the saying in Mt 11^{12} about the violent who since the time of John the Baptist take the Kingdom of Heaven by force. No explanation, says Schweitzer, has heretofore succeeded in making it in any degree intelligible how Jesus could date the presence of the Kingdom from the Baptist, whom in the same breath he places outside of the Kingdom; or why, in order to express so simple an idea as the ordinary explanation that from the days of John the Baptist it has been possible to get into the Kingdom, He uses such entirely unnatural and inappropriate expressions as 'rape' and 'wrest to themselves.' The full difficulties of the passage were first exhibited by Johannes Weiss. Weiss understood that Jesus was describing and condemning a violent Zealotic Messianic movement which had been in progress since the days of the Baptist. But this, again, is to convey a very simple meaning by a very obscure phrase. And where do we hear anything more about a Zealotic Messianic movement of which the Baptist formed the starting-point? Nor, if the saying were condemnatory, would it have been closed with the distinctive formula, 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.' 'We must therefore,' says Schweitzer, 'accept the conclusion that we really do not understand the saying, that we have not ears to hear it.'

But Schweitzer is not disappointed when he does not understand a saying, or even a whole gospel of sayings. For him the joy of life is not the discovery of truth, but the search for it. 'The time is past,' he says, 'for pronouncing judgment upon Lives of Christ on the ground of the solutions which they offer. For us the great men are not those who solved the problems, but those who discovered them. Bauer's *Criticism of the Gospel History* is worth a good dozen Lives of Jesus, because his work, as we are only now coming to recognize, after half a century, is the ablest and most complete collection of the difficulties of the life of Jesus which is anywhere to be found.'

GREEK FOLKLORE AND GREEK RELIGION.

'If any one should attempt to classify ancient Greek literature in modern fashion, under the headings of religion, science, history, drama, and so forth, he would remark one apparent deficiency. While history, philosophy, and poetry of every kind are amply represented, and, however much has perished to be read no more, the choicest blossoms and richest fruit of Greek toil in these fields have been preserved to us, religion seems at first sight to have been almost barren of literary produce. The department of religion pure and simple would have little beyond an Hesiodic Theogony or some Orphic Hymns to exhibit,—and even these have little enough bearing upon real religion.'

What, then, is a writer upon the Religion of Greece to do? He must rely not on any special branch of Greek literature, but rather upon the whole bulk thereof. He must recognize that a religious spirit pervades the whole; that there is hardly a book in the language but has some allusion to religious beliefs and customs, to cults and ceremonies and divine personalities. And last of all he must know and understand the religion of the modern Greek.

Mr. John Cuthbert Lawson, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Pembroke College, Cambridge, has published a volume on *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 12s. net). His title is chosen and his book is written because he has recognized that the best instrument in the hand of the worker in the ancient religion of Greece is a knowledge of the religious customs and beliefs, including the superstitious practices, that are prevalent among

the peasants of modern Greece. He is a student of Greek Literature also. He has read widely and carefully in the ancient literature, watching warily as he read for that religious spirit which he says pervades the whole of it, and for those slight allusions to religious beliefs and customs, to cults and ceremonies and divine personalities, of which there is something in almost every book in the language. But his great discovery was the discovery of analogies and coincidences in the beliefs and customs of modern and of ancient Greece; and for the first time on a large scale he has traced the continuity of the life and thought of the Greek people, and exhibited modern Greek folklore as an essential factor in the interpretation of ancient Greek religion.

In this way Mr. Lawson shows that he has caught the new spirit that has entered into the study of religion, the spirit that recognizes religion as human as well as divine, and subject therefore to the laws to which the human mind is subject, laws of continuity linking century to century and country to country, and laws of universalism in which the peasant has his place as well as the prince, and the Gentile as well as the Jew. And if any one were to turn and say that the new spirit in the study of religion makes religion a merely naturalistic thing, there is not a page in this great book that would not contradict him.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION.

One of the things which the new study of religion has given us is an appreciation of the immense significance of that occasion in the history of Israel when God made Himself known by a personal name. In the old days when theorizing about religion took the place of research, the revelation of God by the personal name of Jahweh was spoken of by some as if it were the evidence of an extremely primitive and savage condition of things, by others again as if it were a retrograde step, both statements being made on the ground that it smelt so rankly of anthropomorphism. But examine the actual history of religion. Go back, for example, into the earliest indications we have of the practice of religion in Rome. What do we find? In the oldest festivals the deities are either very doubtful, or so wanting in clearness and prominence as to be altogether subordinate in interest to the details of the ceremony. Here is good evidence of the indistinctness of the divine; the cult appealed to the people as the practical method of obtaining their desires, but the unseen powers with whom they dealt in this cult were beyond their ken, often unnamed, and visible only in the sense of being seated in, or in some sort symbolized by, tree or stone or animal.

Professor Irving King of the State University of Iowa works the method of research and not of theorizing about religion in his new book entitled *The Development of Religion* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). The book is further described by the sub-title of 'A Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology.' The sub-title is significant, for it is anthropology and psychology that have wrought that revolution in the study of religion which is perhaps the greatest fact of our time. And it is important to notice that Professor King is really a theologian who has made himself acquainted with anthropology and psychology that he may make himself the better theologian. And he has made himself the better theologian thereby. For not only did he find years ago that the study of systematic theology had come to a standstill, and that the way to further progress lay in the systematic theologian making himself acquainted with anthropology and psychology, but, besides that, he has now found that the actual gains from that study—gains to him as a systematic theologian—have far exceeded his utmost expectation. Perhaps the study of the apparent puerilities of savage belief and life is at first repellent. We may be sure that it was repellent to Professor King. But when he found that there was no trifling or even disgusting practice of an Arunta or an Iroquois, but belonged to, and was evidence of, the universal search of man for God, these customs obtained a new interest; and the fear departed that the study of religion in its actual manifestations would remove God or God's initiative out of it. Professor King, it may be well to say explicitly, is a firmer believer in the doctrine of inspiration now than ever he was, and more warmly adores the person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

GOD AND MAN.

Under the comprehensive title of *God and Man* (Putnams), Mr. E. Ellsworth Shumaker,

Ph.D., has written a philosophy of life on its higher planes. He believes that God is seeking to create a being wide-open to all worlds. First, He would have man open to Nature, and has shown this by the way He has made him open and receptive in his body. His physical being is open to all the foods of earth, his lungs are open to the atmosphere, his eyes to light, his ears to sound, his mouth to tastes, and his nostrils to odours. He is influenced by waves of ether from far-off stars, and affected by electricities that flash through the infinite spaces.

He would create a being open also and receptive to Humanity. He would make man sensitive to the tender yet fathomless appeal of the little child; and receptive to the sweetness, and mellowness, and richness, and glory of age. The complete man will be open to the small and the great, the commonplace and the unique, the naïve and the cultured. He will be as open in his affections as in his instincts, as open in his mind as in his heart, as open-souled as open-minded.

The new being will also develop a human personality that is open to universal Law and Order. Physical law, mental law, ethical law, spiritual law—to all these realms God would have man open; not merely as the unconscious subject of them in his body and in his subliminal life, but also as their conscious knower and wide-open recipient.

Again, God would develop a being wide-open to the world of Truth. He would make a man noble enough to love truth for its own pure sake, wise enough to know that truth is the mind's proper and essential food.

Once more, God would produce a personality open on all sides to Beauty. How God must love beauty! He has made earth and sea and sky beautiful, and all the beauty of nature tells of the possible flowering and beauty of human character, and subtly ministers to that high result. Moreover there is the beauty of law and order. And there is the yet higher spiritual beauty of holiness, the costly glories of character.

Finally, God would create a being open wide to Himself, spirit to infinite Spirit. And then, when God has developed a human being on the one side universally and perpetually receptive, He would have him become on the other side universally and perpetually active—on the one side perfect and perpetual childhood toward God, on the other side perfect and perpetual manhood toward humanity.

And what God would have, God will have. Mr. Shumaker's argument is that toward all this God is steadily and successfully working.

SOME ADDRESSES AND SERMONS.

The most important volume of sermons that has been published recently is Principal Selbie's *Aspects of Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). Its contents are sermons indeed. They are not essays or articles or any suspicion of any such thing. They are sermons with a message of salvation and a popular persuasive appeal. And yet their author was chosen Principal of Mansfield College. It speaks well for the college and for the pulpit. In these days it is not possible in any land but our own. They are sermons, let it be added, expressed in skilfully chosen language; but their strength is in their subject. Their subject is Christ—the Christ of the Synoptists, the Christ of Paul, and the rest—but always the Christ who gave His life a ransom.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have also issued *The Church and the Kingdom*, by Professor Denney, one of Sir W. Robertson Nicoll's 'Little Books on Religion' (1s. net).

The sermons of the late Rev. Studholme Wilson, M.A., Rector of Millbrook, Southampton,—at least as seen in an 'in memoriam' volume entitled *Lenten Shadows and Easter Lights* (Nisbet; 3s. 6d. net),—are addressed exclusively to the 'converted.' But in every sermon the appeal is made to the converted to turn again. They are not sent to sleep with comfortable words. This is the note of every sermon in the volume, 'the more thorough conversion of those who have repented and do repent.'

The Rev. Leonard E. Dowsett, the author of *With God in my Garden*, is known to the lover of sermons to children. His new book is *With God among the Flowers* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net). Here is one of the happy ideas in it. There is much talk in the newspapers at present about lazy men. For some scientific Samaritan has come forward to tell us that it is all a thing of physiology—that the lazy men are 'bone lazy' literally. But Mr. Dowsett does not believe it. And so, in one of his sermons, he tells the legend of the campion or catchfly, because the lesson of the legend is 'Beware of

laziness.' Mr. Dowsett believes that laziness is a moral thing. He believes also that it is a very miserable thing, for at the bottom of it laziness is simply lack of interest.

The Rev. Harold Ford, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., has made himself known by his books on the delivery of sermons. He is a powerful advocate of 'extemporaneous preaching.' Now he has published a volume which shows how the sermon that is to be preached extemporaneously should be set down on the manuscript. The title is *Sermons with Analyses* (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net).

The Kingdom Within (Pitman; 3s. 6d. net) looks very like a volume of sermons. But it cannot be, for its author is a lady. Its author is Miss Agnes Stanley Leathes, and as the book is dedicated to her father 'in gratitude for his teaching,' we understand how a lady can write as if she were a popular preacher. In reality the volume contains expositions of a series of passages in St. Luke's Gospel. Nothing is more fashionable than the study of the Christ of this or that Evangelist. But it is rather St. Luke himself than his Christ that Miss Leathes studies. And she has written her book about him because in contact with his personality she has rediscovered her own.

In his *Lenten Readings on the Book of Ruth* (Wells Gardner; 1s. 6d. net), the Rev. James E. Le S. Dawson, M.A., has boldly Christianized the whole story. He is not concerned with Eastern customs, he is interested in the Church of Christ. Ruth stands to us for a type of our own soul, Boaz represents Christ our kinsman and redeemer, and 'the field belonging unto Boaz' is the Church of England—'a part of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, but not the whole of it.'

The Rev. E. Basil Spurgin, M.A., Vicar of Sidcup, has succeeded in combining exposition and exhortation very happily in a series of addresses on *The Work and Fruits of the Holy Spirit* (Wells Gardner; 2s. net). The work of the Holy Spirit, he argues, is (1) to convict the conscience, (2) to lead the will, (3) to dwell in the heart, (4) to quicken the life, and (5) to strengthen the life. Then the fruits of the Spirit are those enumerated by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Galatians.

The busiest man is often the best preacher. For the preacher must have a sense of immediacy and must convey it. The Bishop of London preaches sermons which are models for other ministers, so clear are they in their thought, so simple in their language. And, brief as they are, there is always thought in them. His latest volume is *Into the Fighting-Line* (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d.).

A fresh volume of apologetic is *The Faith and Modern Thought* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net), by William Temple, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. It contains six lectures which were delivered in St. James's Hall, London, last November and December, under the auspices of the London Intercollegiate Christian Unions. We congratulate the Unions. They have discovered an apologist of ability and learning who has a true appreciation of the spiritual needs of our time. He causes no uneasiness either by giving away or by retaining too much. He is neither afraid of criticism, nor does he obtrude it. These things are not forgotten, yet the foundation of God standeth sure. But the most welcome element in the lectures is the knowledge they betray of Comparative Religion and the strength which comes from the sincere study of it.

Just as we conclude this short survey, there is issued a new volume by Canon Hensley Henson, with the title of *Westminster Sermons* (Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). It is divided into three parts—first, Anglicanism; next, Theological and Ecclesiastical; third, Social and National. One of the titles which catches our eye is 'The Original Gospel.' What was that? It was 'preaching the Lord Jesus.' The text is Acts 11^{20}. Canon Henson does not stay to tell us what that means. He does not divide the preaching of the Lord Jesus into one, two, and three. He simply notes the fact that this *was* the earliest Gospel; and then he insists quite firmly that it ought to be the latest. There is, of course, much in the volume about union and reunion, and there is even a sermon on 'Jesus or Christ?' For Canon Henson, although he does not forget that Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, considers it his calling to preach about Jesus Christ to-day, not forgetting the latest folly that has been spoken about Him.

Confessions of a Clergyman.

We are suspicious of confessions. They are often sensational, and sensation is the enemy of truth. They are sometimes the offspring of conceit, and conceit is first cousin to ignorance. But the confessions of this clergyman are inoffensive.

The clergyman, whoever he is, has evidently been earnest to understand the will of God, and earnest to do it. 'My next effort,' he says simply (p. 52), 'was in the nature of a great experiment. I took the Book of Psalms as giving, on the whole, the most spiritual view of God, and I determined to concentrate my mind on one single thought taken from this book—

As the hart panteth after the water brooks,
So panteth my soul after thee, O God.
My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God;
When shall I come and appear before God?

The effort to appropriate the sentiment embodied in these words, and to make it a living personal possession, was a very great one. I cannot honestly say that my success equalled that to which the Psalmist undoubtedly attained, but the attempt at least enabled me to rid myself of many wrong impressions and many false ideals.'

The only doctrine on which he is a heretic is the doctrine of the Trinity. He calls it 'a strange complex metaphysical doctrine,' and sees 'no very good reason why we should not return to a purer and less complicated view of God.' It is a serious heresy. But it is only a matter of belief; his faith has risen above it. The title is *Confessions of a Clergyman* (Bell; 2s. 6d. net).

Poems for Travellers.

There are all sorts of ways of making books, and some of the best ways have probably not been used yet. No one till now ever thought of making a book out of *Poems for Travellers*. Now, however, Mary R. J. Du Bois has done it, and Messrs. George Bell & Sons have published it (5s.). A charming book and packed with matter, though small in size for carrying. Which is the place whose praises the poets have sung most rapturously? That place is Rome. Here are fifteen poems all occupied with the praise of Rome, and there are other poems occupied with the approaches to it.

The Union of the Churches.

Perhaps not very many persons in this wide world can identify the name of the Rev. J. C. Barry, M.A. He did his work quietly in the city of Dumbarton on the Clyde, taking little part in public affairs or prominence in the Presbytery, but ministering to his own congregation, and giving special attention to the subject of garden allotments. But if we mistake not, the book which he has left behind him will have a powerful influence in shaping the thoughts of men throughout Scotland, and perhaps elsewhere also. For it deals with the subject of keenest interest at the present moment, the subject of Church Union, and that with surprising freshness and practical wisdom. Professor Denney has written an introduction to the book. And as in that introduction Professor Denney is also outspoken and emphatic, it is probable that his words will do just the service to his departed friend which he desires to do, and make widely known the real worth of the volume. The title of the book is *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform* (T. & T. Clark; 3s. net).

Church Questions of our Time.

In a single volume called *Church Questions of our Time* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. net), the Rev. J. B. Paton, M.A., D.D., has published six essays contributed by him at various times to various periodicals. Five of them had already appeared together in the second volume of *Criticisms and Essays*, but that volume has for a long time been out of print. The first essay was written more than thirty years ago, yet its subject is just as living to-day as it was then. Its subject is the origin of the priesthood in the Church. We have been making immense progress in everything connected with the Bible. Why is it that things ecclesiastical stand to-day where they stood thirty years ago?

Arabic Prose Composition.

The Rev. T. H. Weir, B.D., M.R.A.S., Lecturer in Arabic in the University of Glasgow, has prepared a manual of *Arabic Prose Composition* (Cambridge Press; 6s. net), which will make his own work and the work of every other teacher of Arabic easier. It is the result of much experience, and it is practical. Private students also may use it, the number of whom it will likely increase. The surprise of it is its accuracy. Mr. Weir was wise to get the proofs read by other scholars besides himself. This measure of exactness would have been impossible for one man, however painstaking.

Existence after Death.

The Ven. Jasper B. Hunt, M.A., B.D., sometime Archdeacon in South America, is a man of in-

dependent mind and some audacity. He has come to the conclusion that preachers and apologists should know a little about what people are thinking before they begin to preach or apologize. Now there are two things about which thinking people are thinking supremely—the first, whether you can do without God; the second, whether you can do without immortality. So Mr. Hunt wrote a book recently on *Good without God, is it possible?* And a clever capable book it was. Now he has written a book on *Existence after Death* (Allenson; 5s. net). And it is not less capable or convincing.

It is not less capable or convincing, although Mr. Hunt is a theologian, and the book is a book of science. For with patient determination he has set aside his theological prepossessions and has given himself to the study of science, so far at least as it affects his subject. His argument is that science, regarded in the gross, dictates the spirituality of man, and strongly implies a spiritual destiny for individual human beings. It is something to say that he seems to reach the height of that high argument and make it good.

Of the things he has made quite clear, this is one, that in order to be a thanatist (that is, an unbeliever in immortality), one must be an atheist. For if God is, man is immortal.

The Drink Problem.

Facts and figures, arguments and appeals—all this and all ready to hand in *Social Aspects of the Drink Problem*, by J. Alfred Sharp (Culley; 6d. net).

Folk-lore of the Holy Land.

Mr. J. E. Hanauer is a contributor to the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, and in that very interesting periodical we have already read some of his folk-lore stories. Here, under the title of *Folk-lore of the Holy Land* (Duckworth; 5s. net), all he has heard that are worth repeating of those interpretations of life which go by the convenient name of folk-lore are brought together. And a very amusing volume they make. Nothing can be done in the way of reviewing the volume, except to quote one of its stories. Let it be one of the judgments of Karakash.

A weaver, closing his shop for the night, left a long needle sticking in his work on the loom. A thief got in with a false key, and, as he was stumbling about in the dark, the needle put out one of his eyes. He went out again, and locked the door behind him.

Next morning, he told his story to Karakash, the impartial judge, who at once sent for the weaver, and eyeing him sternly, asked—

'Did you leave a packing-needle in the cloth on your loom when you shut your shop last night?'

'Yes.'

'Well, this poor thief has lost his eye through your carelessness; he was going to rob your shop; he stumbled, and the needle pierced his eye. Am I not Karakash, the impartial judge? This poor thief has lost an eye through your fault; so you shall lose an eye in like manner.'

'But, my lord,' said the weaver, 'he came to rob me; he had no right there.'

'We are not concerned with what this robber came to do, but with what he did. Was your shop door broken open or damaged this morning; or was anything missing?'

'No.'

'He has done you no harm then, and you do but add insult to injury by throwing up his way of life against him. Justice demands that you lose an eye.' The weaver offered money to the robber, to the Kadi, but in vain; the impartial judge would not be moved. At last, a bright thought struck him, and he said: 'An eye for an eye is justice, O my lord the Kadi; yet in this case it is not quite fair on me. You are the impartial judge, and I submit to you that I, being a married man with children, shall suffer more damage in the loss of an eye than this poor robber, who has no one dependent on him. How could I go on weaving with but one eye? But I have a good neighbour, a gunsmith, who is a single man. Let one of his eyes be put out. What does he want with two eyes, for looking along gun-barrels?' The impartial judge, struck with the justice of these arguments, sent for the gunsmith, and had his eye put out.

Maclaren's Expositions.

The fifth series of Dr. Maclaren's Expositions of Holy Scripture is to contain eight volumes, making thirty-two volumes in all. This is the fifth. It contains the exposition of 2 *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Philemon, and Hebrews i–vi* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). The wonder of it is the number of texts which Dr. Maclaren has taken in the course of his

life from the Second Epistle to Timothy. He has taken no fewer than fourteen.

The Heroes and Martyrs of Faith.

The old habit of expository preaching possesses its old power still when it falls into the hands of a master. We do not know for certain that Professor Peake preached those chapters on the great roll-call of the Epistle to the Hebrews which make up his book *The Heroes and Martyrs of Faith* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). He describes them himself as 'Studies in the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.' But certainly they might have been preached. They recall to us just what we have said—those great days of preaching when the same congregation sat under the same preacher, Sunday after Sunday for many Sundays on end, and listened with great delight to the exposition of some fertile portion of Scripture. Not since Dr. Dale, so far as we can remember, has anybody handled any part of the Epistle to the Hebrews with so keen a sense at once of the earliest readers of the Epistle and of the latest, with so keen an appreciation of the circumstances which called it into being, and of the circumstances to which it can now be so unchangeably applied. The book is a delight to read from cover to cover.

Anglican Church Handbooks.

Since we noticed the 'Anglican Church Handbooks,' edited by Principal Griffith Thomas, four volumes have been published. These are *The English Church in the Seventeenth Century*, by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A.; *Old Testament History*, by the Rev. F. Ernest Spencer, M.A.; *The Incarnation*, by the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M.A.; and *Christianity is Christ*, by the Editor (Longmans; 1s. net each). Dr. Griffith Thomas was a most proper man to select for the editorship of a cheap series of handbooks. He has a name that is known and a position that is unmistakable. And being chosen, it is evident that he gave himself heartily to the work, selecting his authors with care and then leaving them free to do themselves justice. His own volume proves that he is a wide reader and that he can command his reading. The title is taking, and it is as true as it is taking. He treats the subject historically, moving from point to point and making sure of his ground as he goes. But the series altogether deserves the wide circulation it is meant for.

The Religion of the Chinese.

Professor J. J. M. de Groot of Leyden is the great literary authority on the religion of China. So, of course, he took the religion of China as his subject when he went to Hartford to deliver the Hartford-Lamson lectures on the Religions of the World. Whether he delivered the lectures in English we are not told. But he knows English. He can speak it with freedom, and he can write it with taste. His great book on this very subject was written in English that it might reach the greater public.

Here then is a sketch, reliable and masterly, and quite good to read for reading's sake, of that which is the greatest force in the nation, and which all the prophets tell us is to become the greatest force in the wide world. The title is *The Religion of the Chinese* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

The Ethics of Jesus.

The latest volume on *The Ethics of Jesus* is an addition to the 'New Testament Handbooks' edited by Dr. Shailer Mathews (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). Its author is the Rev. Henry Churchill King, D.D., President of Oberlin College. Dr. King is aware of the recent rapid increase in the literature of his subject. For one bad moment he doubted if it was his duty to add to it. He will not misunderstand us if we say that the greatest merit of his book is its clear recognition of the fact that a book on the Ethics of Jesus cannot be written. For Jesus was never a teacher of Ethics, but of Religion.

Dr. King recognizes this. He separates as he can. But he knows he cannot in one single instance separate what Christ says on conduct from what he says on belief. Take the beatitude of the pure in heart as an example. Purity—is there any topic of teaching more distinctly ethical? But it is purity in heart here. And 'Jesus clearly believes (we quote Dr. King now) that such purity in heart can belong only to those who have a deep reverence for the sacredness of the person.' And then he refers in a footnote to 'the clear insight of the article of Boys-Smith on "Purity" in the DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS,' and quotes these words: 'To make common, *i.e.* to vulgarize, is the way to make impure: profanity is the ruin of purity. A well-spring of living water, fenced about by reverence,—that is "purity."' 'I have long believed,' he says, 'that the positive side

of purity could not be truly characterized without bringing into prominence the spirit of reverence for the person as essential to it.'

The Road to Happiness.

Miss Constance Williams has translated Yvonne Sarcey's *La Route du Bonheur—The Road to Happiness* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net). It is the young woman's guide to all goodness in this life. One chapter discusses the four K's of the German ideal—*Kinder*, *Kleider*, *Kirche*, *Küche*, and disapproves of them. 'A woman only begins to be really ideal when she has learned to forget her multifarious occupations and her own personal worries, to think only of those her husband brings home with him, to smooth them out with a smile. Certainly her sphere is the house, her children, the kitchen; but it is her part to reconquer each day, by the charms of her grace and beauty, that husband ever inclined to be fickle and fond of change.'

The Lowly Estate.

The book lover is never weary of reading about books. He may not read many books; for the lover of books and the reader of books are different persons. But he is never weary of reading books about books.

One of the pleasantest books about books which it has ever been the book lover's fortune to find is an anonymous book called *The Lowly Estate*, published by Mr. Andrew Melrose (5s. net). The author is himself a lover of books and a believer in them. 'If your interest is in literature,' he says, 'there are no limits to the legitimate objects for your conversation and no room for the development of the lower passions. The wider your knowledge, the deeper your humility becomes, the more gracious your spirit. Are you a reader? You know where beauty lies. Are you a writer? You have some truth to communicate and a holy zeal to do it. Nor in this case have you any competition to fear, any rival of whom to be jealous; your public is your own inalienable asset, your sole competitor is yourself. In the world of literature every man is equal and every man is king. And in the language common among kings, every king is "my well-beloved brother."'

The book is all about books. Once or twice the author makes an effort to get away from them. But that is evidently only that he may return to them with the greater zest; and at the utmost it is only for a run into the garden. So great a lover of books is he that he can even accept selections. He admits, of course, that he is not easily enamoured of selections. But he admits also that he has just added to his store a reprint of the *Selections from the Writings of John Ruskin*, which was first published in 1862. Let our anonymous writer encourage us to read Ruskin in the books from which these selections are taken, as he here wisely does encourage us, and leave the selections alone. For Ruskin in selections is art without nature, exaggeration without the thing exaggerated. The only volume of selections that can be read as if it were the original is the volume that was made many years ago from the writings of George Eliot.

The reader of books who is not a book lover complains that books about books have nothing to say. Of course not; except about books. This anonymous author never tries to say anything; he simply talks about books. And the book lover calls him well-beloved.

The Struggle with Puritanism.

The Struggle with Puritanism is the title of the latest of the 'Handbooks of English Church History,' edited by the Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D. (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net). Has Puritanism no place, then, in the Church of England? Is it altogether an alien and an enemy? If it is so, the Church of England is narrower in compass and poorer in contents than we thought it was. This, at any rate, is the position that is occupied by the Rev. Bruce Blaxland, M.A., Vicar of the Abbey Church, Shrewsbury. And it is not occupied by inadvertence. Mr. Blaxland is thoroughly aware of what he is doing. Is it because he feels his position so strong that he is so dispassionate? There is no vituperation of Puritanism. It is treated as a foe, but the laws of warfare are respected. There is no lament that its strong men should have been the enemies of the English Church, but it is admitted that they were strong men. And so it comes to pass that after the reading of the book, with all its uncompromising and unwavering hostility, the impression is somehow left that Puritanism is the name for the real religion of the nation throughout that period from James I. to William and Mary, which the author describes under the title of 'The Struggle with Puritanism.' Given Mr. Blaxland's conception of the Church of

England, he cannot be called an unfair historian; but we hope and believe that the history of the Church of England throughout this period is a greater thing than he takes it to be.

A Life Story.

There is no life so pleasant as that of a country minister in Scotland. Read *My Life Story* (Oliphant; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. John Hume Wells, Senior Minister of Dunbarney United Free Church, Bridge of Earn. It is a life full of incident, although there never was a battle or a street brawl within its hearing. For body, mind, and spirit are all at work and all in health. Moreover, Mr. Wells can tell his story. Here is his description of a scene in the General Assembly which has had many an historian.

'My only other recollection of this distinguished man [Professor Robertson Smith] is when I sat as a member of the General Assembly, and heard him make his defence before the fathers and brethren. To see that child of a man stand before so many learned judges, and, without book or note in his hand, go over a number of intricate points, and state his views with a strange mixture of boldness (or, as some thought, impertinence) and calm self-possession, was an experience never to be forgotten. His opponents were amazed, and his supporters triumphant. Chapters and verses were handled as freely as if they were articles lying before him. His memory held all, and his mind's eye pierced through all. The utter absence of emotion in his tones, when every one's feelings in the crowded house were strung up to the highest pitch, had a weird effect. He neither rose to eloquence, nor sank to commonplace, but went on steadily, ploughing his way through masses of facts and difficulties and conflicting theories.

'There was no wit except once, and that was in a hidden form, which, however, all could detect. He came to the charge that he was imperilling the Ark of God. Dr. Begg had solemnly said that, like Eli, he trembled for the Ark of God in the hands of this young Levite. He caught up this, and said in a startling voice, "But, Moderator, who was this Eli, who trembled for the Ark of God? A worldly ecclesiastic!" He added no more, but on he went with his defence. But the hit was so sudden and keen, and so applicable to the less admirable side of Dr. Begg's character, that loud laughter followed.'

Protestant Missions in the Near East.

In his recent volume of the Reformation in Scotland, Dr. Hay Fleming describes the causes which led to the Reformation, and gives the first place to the circulation of books and pamphlets. There is a greater matter than the Reformation of Religion in Scotland. It is the progress of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The time is coming when men will recognize the enormous influence that may be exercised by missionary literature. Then honour will be given to the publishing house of Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier.

It is fitting that a firm with its headquarters in Edinburgh should be the greatest publishers in Britain of the literature of Missions. And it is fortunate. For not only are many books written in Scotland, but also into it, the great book-reading country, are poured English, American, and Continental books on Missions, that they may be circulated everywhere from this centre. And thus it comes to pass that Dr. Julius Richter gets his great histories of modern missionary enterprise translated and published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier in Edinburgh.

The new volume is *A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East* (10s. 6d.). The Near East embraces the Muhammadan Lands. It includes Turkey and Armenia, Syria and Palestine, Persia, Egypt and Abyssinia, and at least a considerable part of the work amongst the Jews.

Now Dr. Richter is an impartial historian. If the Jews can tolerate the story of Jewish missions in any form, they will be able to read the story told here. He is also an accurate historian. The pains he takes to reach the truth indicates a new conception of what history means, at any rate religious history. And, finally, he knows the necessity of so writing that he will be read. He has a German style which can be rendered into English and accepted as literature.

The account of the Armenian massacres is a good example. Here it is of the utmost necessity that the facts be facts. Credible they scarcely can be, so inhumanly do some human beings behave. As for interest, that needs no importation. 'The crowd, supplied with arms by the authorities, joined most amicably with the soldiers and the Kurdish Hamidiye on these festive occasions. Every one was in good humour. The Turkish women stimulated their heroes by raising the

guttural shriek of their war-cry, the Zilghit, and deafened the hopeless despair of their victims by singing their nuptial songs.'

The Problem of Evil.

The Augustinian doctrine of sin is passing at present through a fierce fire of criticism. But it must be said that some of its critics have very little knowledge of what the Augustinian doctrine of sin is. Before they write anything more about it, they should read a volume entitled *The Problem of Evil*, which has been written by Dr. Marion Le Roy Burton, formerly Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology at Yale University, and now President of Smith College (Open Court Publishing Co.). No doubt a thorough study of Augustine himself would be still more useful, but it would take more time. This is a critical examination of Augustine, and competent. The author has read all the other great criticisms of Augustine and all the other great books on sin. But he knows Augustine for himself.

Judaism in Music.

Mr. William Reeves, of Charing Cross Road, has had a translation made of Wagner's *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, the original essay and the later supplement. The translator is Mr. Edwin Evans, Senior, who has furnished the essay with Notes and an Introduction. The title is *Judaism in Music* (3s. 6d.).

A Life of Christ.

The Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A., has arranged the narrative of the Four Gospels, so as to form a new Diatessaron. But what he has omitted he has omitted out of no dogmatic malice, but simply to avoid repetition. He has taken the text of the Revised Version, to which he has added footnotes in explanation of difficulties, and occasionally in recommendation of the doctrine, very much after the manner of the most approved modern commentaries. The title is *The Life of our Blessed Lord* (Rivingtons; 3s. 6d.).

In the Primitive Church.

The Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.A., has rewritten the Acts of the Apostles in a form suitable for the English reader of the present day. That is to say, he has rewritten the history contained in the Acts of the Apostles according as he himself is able to understand it, and as he thinks it should be understood by others, if the profit of the book is to be made available for present controversy as well as for present conduct. The title is *Turning-Points in the Primitive Church* (Thynne; 3s. net). The volume forms one of Mr. Thynne's 'Theological Library,' every volume of which is evangelical to the core.

The Doctrine of Creation.

Mr. Fisher Unwin has published a discussion of *The Doctrine of Creation*, written by C. M. Walsh (3s. 6d. net). The conclusion is that a doctrine of creation out of nothing, although conceivable and possible, is not taught in Scripture, and is probably not true. Still less has been said, or can be said, for the doctrine of the creation of the world from an eternally existing matter. Therefore the true doctrine of creation is that the world is an emanation from God Himself. From first to last the discussion is conducted with learning, ability, and reverence.

Mr. Fisher Unwin has also published an extremely attractive edition of *The Following of Christ*, by John Tauler, done into English by J. R. Morell (3s. 6d. net). The first edition was issued in 1886 by Messrs. Burns & Oates. This is described as the second impression. It is a notable addition to the devotional shelf. Such books are more in demand now than they were in 1886. Another impression is sure to be called for shortly.

The Old Egyptian Faith.

The first series of lectures on the Michonis Foundation were delivered at the Collège de France in 1905. The lecturer was Dr. Naville, Professor of Egyptology at the University of Geneva. For the six lectures Professor Naville selected six principal topics, the development of which appeared to him likely to offer a general idea of the Egyptian Religion. The lectures were published under the title of *La Religion des Anciens Égyptiens*. They have now been translated into English by the Rev. Colin Campbell, D.D., and issued as a volume of Messrs. Williams & Norgate's 'Crown Theological Library,' under the title of *The Old Egyptian Faith* (5s.). There is no safer guide to the Religion of Egypt than Professor Naville, and no pleasanter exponent of it. This volume is simple enough to serve as first steps, and the illustrations though not numerous are well chosen.

The Ring of Pope Xystus.

Mr. F. C. Conybeare is the translator and commentator of the first English edition of *The Ring of Pope Xystus*, which has been published most attractively by Messrs. Williams & Norgate (4s. 6d. net). The translator believes that *The Ring of Pope Xystus* is a Christian recension, made not later than the middle of the second century, of an earlier collection of aphorisms, and perhaps of a collection of such collections. It is neither wholly Stoic, nor wholly Pythagorean, but as it has come down to us, we are bound to attribute it to a Christian. The Shorter Catechism says, 'Some sins in themselves, and by reason of several aggravations, are more heinous in the sight of God than others.' Pope Xystus says, 'Deem not one sin to be lesser than another.' Are they both right?

Bible Notes.

For the last six years courses of 'Bible Notes' have appeared in the *Friend*, and have been republished in attractive little volumes with interleaved writing-paper. The sixth volume, reprinting the papers of 1909, deals with the writings of Paul. The author is the Rev. Robert S. Franks, M.A., of Woodbrooke, a man who has a keen sense of the value of accurate up-to-date scholarship, and a teacher who can write for teachers. The book may be had from the Woodbrooke Extension Committee, 3 George Street, Croydon (1s. net).

The Social Gospel.

In the present welter on the social question it is necessary to know whom to read. Professor Shailer Mathews is one who may be read, and who will even richly repay reading. He has already published *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, in 1897, as well as *The Church and the Changing Order*, in 1907. Now he has published *The Social Gospel* (Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press; 50 cents net). It is a beginner's book, and covers the whole social continent. At the end of each chapter there are questions on the chapter itself and questions for further study.

The Disciples and Christ's Resurrection.[1]

By Professor the Rev. J. S. Banks, D.D., Headingley College, Leeds.

Two things clearly appear from the Resurrection narratives. First, that the attitude of the Apostles and other disciples towards the idea of resurrection was at first one of doubt, not to use a stronger term; and secondly, that the doubt was replaced by faith on the first Easter Sunday. The fact that the women, who had watched the burial by Joseph of Arimathea, brought spices to anoint the body shows that they had no expectation of a resurrection. The same is proved of the Apostles and others by the way in which they received the first reports brought by the women of what they had seen and heard at the grave. They tell the Apostles of the empty grave, the message of the angels and of Christ Himself who had met them as they were returning; Mary Magdalene, in particular, tells of her interview with the Risen One. 'And these words appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them' (Lk 24^{11}, Mk 16^{11}). Peter and John then go to the grave, and find the conditions as the women had said. Peter returned home 'wondering,' perplexed, unable to explain what he saw. John says of himself that he 'believed.' This is John's recollection after many years of his feeling at the time; but it does not appear that he said anything to others on the subject.

There is no sign whatever of any predisposition to faith on the disciples' part, but the opposite. If we think that this is improbable in view of the references of Christ during His life to His death and rising again, we are reading our views into the Apostles' circumstances. Full consideration of the earthly Messianic views of the disciples and the extraordinary character of the resurrection idea will suggest an opposite conclusion. The fact that the Evangelists record both the predictions of the Resurrection by Christ and the failure of the disciples to understand them is certainly evidence of honesty. It would seem that, despite all Christ said before-

[1] See *The Appearances of our Lord after His Passion*. By H. B. Swete, D.D. Macmillan. 2s. 6d. net.

hand on the subject, the facts were so transcendent that their meaning could not be gathered from words, but only from the final issues. The first attitude of the disciples was natural, and one that we should have taken in their circumstances.

It is no less certain that on the first Easter Sunday the attitude of doubt gave place to faith, and that three occasions of the great change were Christ's appearance to Peter, to the two Emmaus disciples, and to the assembled apostles and others. There can be little doubt that the report brought by the Emmaus travellers on 'that very day' made a deep impression on the disciples (Lk 24^{35}), and all the more that it was preceded by the testimony of Peter. The Emmaus travellers found the eleven and others 'saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon' (v.^{33}). The only other reference to the appearance to Peter is Paul's definite statement (1 Co 15^{5}). We can easily understand how Paul knew this. When he went to Jerusalem three years after his conversion (Gal 1^{18}) to interview Peter, they must often during the fifteen days have interchanged views respecting the past. Nothing is said of what took place between the Lord and Peter. Probably Paul himself did not know. The subject was too personal and sacred for Peter to speak of in detail. His testimony to the eleven first broke the gloom resting on the disciples; and so Peter fulfilled the charge of Christ, 'Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren' (chap. 22^{32}).

We may note parenthetically that some difficulty is caused by the remark in the Mark appendix that the assembled disciples did not believe on the report of the Emmaus travellers (chap. 16^{13}). Dr. Swete's comment is: 'Mark's statement is either from a later and less accurate account, or it must be taken to refer to some who still held out against the growing evidence of the Resurrection.'

The twofold witness of Peter and the Emmaus reporters is then finally sealed by the sudden appearance of the Lord Himself in the midst of the assembled disciples (Lk $24^{36\text{-}42}$). The disciples are naturally 'terrified and affrighted,' and think that it is a spirit. Christ reasons with the doubt, and shows them His hands and His feet. While they still 'disbelieved for joy, and wondered,' He takes food with them, and proceeds to expound the fulfilment of O.T. prophecy in what has taken place. This appearance and action of Christ Himself evidently completes the work of conviction in the case at least of the majority of the apostles.[1] Thomas is dealt with separately. Luke's words, 'disbelieved for joy, and wondered,' while verbally different, substantially accord with John's words, 'The disciples were glad when they saw the Lord' (20^{20}). This complete account of what took place on the first Easter Sunday is found in St. Luke (chap. 24), and it is not crossed in any serious respect by anything in the three other accounts. It might seem as if the account of the Ascension (v.^{50}) followed immediately on what precedes, but this is not necessarily the case. There is some difficulty in fitting in the scene on the lake in the Johannine appendix (chap. 21), but this is only part of the larger question of the relation of the Galilean and the Judæan ministry as well as of the Synoptic and the Johannine Gospels.

On the events of Easter Sunday Dr. Swete remarks: 'The appearances on Easter Day, regarded as a whole, bear the stamp of the mind of Jesus Christ; the Easter sayings are such as no sane criticism can attribute to the imagination of the Apostolic Age. It needs a sturdy scepticism to doubt that these narratives rest on a solid basis of fact, or that words so characteristic of the great Master are in substance the words of the Risen Christ.'

Only Paul mentions the appearance to James (1 Co 15^{7}). But the statement has every element of probability in its favour, especially in view of the position taken by James in the Church at Jerusalem. It does not appear that the brothers of the Lord had believed during His life. James becoming a believer was probably due to the Resurrection, and is strong evidence of the truth of the Resurrection. What more natural than that Christ should appear to James, who seems to have been the oldest of His brethren, and was a strong character? Paul would certainly learn the fact in the interview at Jerusalem already referred to.

The peculiar character of the intercourse between Christ and the disciples during the forty days is best explained on the supposition of a change in His person that is going on but is not complete. Not complete, for He eats with them: and yet great, for He is not recognized at first. It is so with Mary Magdalene and the disciples beside the

[1] Luke says 'eleven.' He does not refer to the case of Thomas, but seems to blend the two scenes together; cf. Lk 24^{39} and Jn 20^{27}.

lake, as well as the two Emmaus disciples, although in the last instance it is specially said that 'their eyes were holden.' He does not remain with the disciples, but comes and goes at pleasure. He appears in their midst 'when the doors were shut,' and as suddenly vanishes. Dr. Forrest reminds us that Christ here hovers between or belongs to two worlds, the earthly and the spiritual, exhibiting the characteristics of both. 'Christ hovers, as it were, on the border line of two different worlds, and partakes of the characteristics of both, because He is revealing the one to the other.' Strange as it may seem, this condition is natural in the circumstances of the case. Any other account would have raised objections. His body was in process of spiritualization. He had not yet the complete spiritual or glorified body of the heavenly life, but was on the way to it. The final, permanent transfiguration was going on. Hence the doubts of some spectators, apparently to the last. 'Some doubted,' is said of the appearance to the eleven on the mountain in Galilee (Mt 28^{17}), which appearance Dr. Swete identifies with that to 'above five hundred brethren at once' (1 Co 15^{6}), 'of whom the greater part' were living when St. Paul wrote.

Two other details referred to by Dr. Swete are worthy of mention. He thinks that the Ascension (not in Galilee, but 'over against Bethany') presents even a greater difficulty to modern thought than the Resurrection. It seems directly to transgress the most elementary laws of matter. But we must remember the 'spiritual' body, the change being completed at the Ascension. The essence of the Ascension is the definitive withdrawal into the spiritual world, which is not of necessity remote from the material world. The very idea of remoteness belongs only to the material; the same applies to Ascension and all physical movement. 'It is a fact, as we believe, that forty days more or less after the Resurrection the Lord finally withdrew His risen body from the eyes and touch of His disciples, and that in the moment of His disappearance He was enveloped by a passing cloud, which travelled upwards as if it were carrying Him up to heaven. And this fact was a symbol of a great and vital Christian truth, which is also a fact, but in the spiritual world.' 'He is *at the right hand of God*, in the highest region to which human nature can attain; and yet behind the thin veil of phenomena He is still in our midst.'

Dr. Swete also emphasizes the idea of the 'spiritual' body in regard to the future resurrection of the dead. 'What is meant by resurrection in this sense? Not resuscitation, as many of the teachers of the ancient Church supposed, but as St. Paul teaches, the clothing of the spirit with a spiritual body.' The literal sense was the one generally held in early days, as by Tertullian, Jerome, and even Augustine. Origen and the Alexandrians advocated a more spiritual view, but in vain. The Roman form of the Apostles' Creed said 'resurrection of the flesh,' and even 'this flesh.' See Dr. Swete's work on the Apostles' Creed, p. 93 ff.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, M.A., D.D., Edinburgh.

Ignorance, Christian, and Hopeful.

Revelations.

This last part of the discourse between the pilgrims and Ignorance is the cleverest of all, and that which shows the furthest insight into character and human nature. Ignorance upon the question of revelations reveals himself and his whole attitude to life and thought. He is opposed to mysteries of all kinds—and that in this so mysterious world, where every 'flower in the crannied wall' contains, if we could but read it, the whole mystery of God and man.

It is, unfortunately, a familiar attitude of mind in all generations. 'Jupiter' Carlyle, in his *Autobiography*, speaks of some one as 'a good man, and had not a particle of enthusiasm.' Froude

with that wearisome air of superiority of his, discounts the deeper and more wonderful elements in John Bunyan's religious experience, in such a fashion as to give the impression that no man of culture could possibly take them seriously. It is this air which tries the faith of some, and (it may be confessed with little shame) the patience of others, who read his book. We know the type well enough. Such men discount all revelations as matters not to be considered, and confine themselves to reasonings, judgments, and opinions which are intelligible to the meanest intelligence. In a word, they discount every experience or conviction which rises above the dead level of mere common sense. They are shy of the spiritual and 'afraid of that which is high.' While reading them one has to remember that common sense is indeed an excellent thing in its place and for its own levels, but that sometimes it may become the very servant of the devil, just as sentiment may become his handmaid.

There is, indeed, a pretended revelation, detached from knowledge and inquiry, which includes any whimsical fancy of a visionary mind. Such imaginations, half-sane and unbalanced, are worthy of the strongest reprobation which any critic can give them. But besides these there is such a thing as genuine revelation of definite spiritual truths. The days of the Spirit are not yet done, and the soul and conscience may still receive assurances of spiritual truth, clear and direct. Luther finely expresses the distinction when he says (Gal 1^{15}): 'For Paul himself had no inward revelation, until he had heard the outward word from heaven, which was this, *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me*? (Acts ix. 4). First, therefore, he heard the outward word, then afterwards followed revelations, the knowledge of the word, faith, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost.' John Bunyan's autobiography is full of the records of such experiences:—'That scripture fastened on my heart,' 'That sentence darted in upon me,' 'These words did with great power break in upon me,' 'Suddenly this sentence fell upon my soul,' etc. etc. Every Christian knows what that great text means, 'When it pleased God to reveal his Son in me.' But the distinction between self-evolved revelations, emanating from one's own fancy or desire, and the seizure of the soul by authentic words of God, is too fine and too profound for Ignorance to understand. It requires intellect, and intellect trained to spiritual discernment, to distinguish between the will-o'-the-wisp and the fire of God's illumination.

So Ignorance falls behind, nursing his foregone conclusions; a man of prejudice and fatal twist of mind. He is open to no new light. Light falling on him only annoys him. It would be torture to him to be 'bare to the universal prick of light.' A passage in Nathaniel Hawthorne's *English Note-Books* (ii. 7) is strikingly relevant to this situation: 'York is full of old churches . . . and in some of them I noticed windows quite full of painted glass, a dreary kind of patchwork, all of one dark and dusty line, when seen from the outside. Yet had I seen them from the interior of the church, there doubtless would have been rich and varied apparitions of saints, with their glories round their heads, and bright-winged angels, and perhaps even the Almighty Father Himself, so far as conceivable and representable by human powers. It requires light from heaven to make them visible. If the church were merely illuminated from the inside—*i.e.* by what light a man can get from his own understanding—the pictures would be invisible, or wear, at least, but a miserable aspect.' So Ignorance saunters along, with a very clear apprehension of the details of the road about his feet, but with the haziest of notions either as to the object, or the meaning, or the goal of his pilgrimage.

It is this pathetic tragedy which awakens the pity of Christian. Harsh, indeed, he has been in his address to this foolish man, and austere in his denunciation of him and his folly. Yet after all he too is a man with a soul to save and little chance of saving it. He 'much pities this poor man,' and tries to win him by a loving appeal. That is the sure mark of grace in the follower of Jesus. 'Jupiter' Carlyle tells of one Robin Sad, the landlord of the Three Kings at Yarmouth, that he 'entertained us much, for he had been several years a mate in the Mediterranean in his youth, and was vain and boastful, presumptuous and ignorant, to my great delight.' St. Paul, writing about some of the Ignorances of his day, has to confess that I 'now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ.' Such characters are interesting, and most of those who meet them tell about them to others. But only Paul and those who have, like Paul, received the Spirit of Jesus Christ, weep as they tell it.

Right Fear.

Ignorance drops behind, and the pilgrims beguile the way with a discourse suggested by him. It seems that he is a common type—one of so many that we gather this to be Bunyan's opinion of the majority of his fellow-countrymen. He is, indeed, 'the average man'; and in the discourse which follows it is the average man with whom we are dealing. The question is, whether such men are really as complacent and contented as they seem, and the answer is that they all have convictions, but, being ignorant as to the spiritual value of these, they do their best to stifle them, with only too good success.

It is in this way that we come in sight of the value of right fear. For a long while we have been journeying in company with Hopeful, an exceptional and rare journey among Puritan guides. Dr. Whyte has pointed out, *e.g.*, that for two references to hope, Goodwin has a hundred and twenty-four references to fear. John Bunyan also knew the value and felt the need of fear, and no one felt more keenly than he the danger and treachery of false, light-hearted, or thoughtless hope. In *The Holy War*, he introduces Pitiless, and makes him assert that his name was not Pitiless, but Cheer Up—a touch displaying far-reaching insight into character and knowledge of men. In this connexion it is interesting to recall Montaigne's open and desperate war against fear. 'The thing in the world I am most afraid of is fear,' he tells us (i. 17); and again, 'I do not find myself strong enough to sustain the force and impetuosity of this passion of fear. . . . Whoever should once make my soul lose her footing, would never set her upright again: she retastes and researches herself too profoundly, and too much to the quick, and therefore would never let the wound she had received heal and cicatrise. It has been well for me that no sickness has yet discomposed her; at every charge made upon me, I preserve my utmost opposition and defence; by which means the first that should rout me would keep me from ever rallying again. I have no after-game to play.' But the Christian's play is all after-game. It begins when he has lost his footing, and his life is one long wonderful rallying again from the disaster of sin and the misery of right fear. Bunyan is very clear upon this, and his long treatise 'On the Fear of God' deals with the matter very fully. 'Take heed,' he says in that treatise, 'of hardening thy heart at any time against convictions of judgments. I bid you before to beware of a hard heart, now I bid you beware of hardening your soft heart. The fear of the Lord is the pulse of the soul. Pulses that beat are the best signs of life; but the worst show that life is present. Intermitting pulses are dangerous. David and Peter had an intermitting pulse in reference to this fear.'

Christian is no coward, and the adjective *right* is in italics when he speaks of right fear. The word fear has two senses, according as it relates to dangerous or to sublime things. In the one connexion it is a sense of danger; in the other it is the faculty of reverence, the habit of wonder, the continued power of awe and admiration. Christian's analysis of it includes both these senses. (1) It rises in the conviction of sin—not (it will be observed) in the approach of punishment, but in the horror of sin itself, as a thing to be abhorred apart from its consequences. (2) It leads to a laying hold on Christ for salvation—in which the sense of danger and the faculty of reverence are combined. (3) It begets in the soul a great reverence for God—the second of the above-named elements. This reverence for God, and, in general, reverence for anything that is high and great, is a matter needing very special attention at the present time. Wordsworth told us that 'we live by admiration'; but a century of scientific and industrial and commercial progress has tended to an immense increase in man's belief in himself, his efficiency, and his will, and to a corresponding decline of the habit of veneration. It is striking that in modern books on Theosophy the ancient doctrine is being repeated with as much insistence as ever, that the first stage in the initiation of disciples is just this—the laying aside of the exercise of criticism, and leaving the soul open to receive and venerate the great thoughts and the memories of great men. Here, in a few pregnant and suggestive words, Bunyan gives us as thoughtful an exposition of what that involves as we may hope to find anywhere. In reverence there is the appreciation of God's *honour*, of the value of *peace*, of the witness of the *Spirit*, and of the respect due to *public opinion*. These are simply thrown out, and passed from in the discourse. But they will well repay an hour of careful thought, which may help us to rehabilitate the difficult exercise of

veneration by dwelling on these successive phases of its meaning.

An Episode.

Hopeful, however, finds this conversation a somewhat severe mental exercise for the drowsy region; and, indeed, so powerful a piece of analysis is ill suited to a lethargic mood. Indeed, this very episode, interrupting the discourse in so simple, yet so lively a fashion, seems to be a quite conscious literary device on the part of the writer to break the monotonous enchantment of the place. Hopeful assents languidly to Christian's views, and asks whether they are not now almost past the Enchanted Ground. In spite of his disclaimer, we suspect him of being just a little bored with Christian's lecturing. His is a young and sunny spirit, intent upon the concrete rather than the abstract, and finding it difficult to concentrate his attention with the same tenacity as the older and more austere man. Besides, the subject is uncongenial to him. It is hardly to be wondered at that Hopeful should find it more or less distasteful to talk much about *fear*, right or wrong. The whole scenery and experience of the journey of Christian with Hopeful are of a lighter sort than those of Faithful's journey. Ease, the Enchanted Ground, the Land of Beulah—there were no such scenes as these in Faithful's shorter and more tragic march. Yet Christian can never forget that there has been Doubting Castle in this easier road, and he has his own rigorous way of keeping his friend awake.

Right Fear again.

So he strenuously returns to his lecture, and proceeds with an analysis so incisive and so original that it must appeal to the mind of the drowsiest of listeners. Such ignorant persons as those he is discussing are conventional to the very bone. Their whole system of ideas is taken for granted and accepted as the obvious and only possible way of conceiving things. Fear, intruding upon this mass of accepted conventionalities, is at once condemned as wrong. (1) Their conventional system is supposed to be of the divine ordering, and, therefore, fear must be of the devil—nowadays we would say it is of the liver, or the nerves, meaning just what they meant. (2) It is supposed to spoil their faith, by which they mean their acceptance of convention. It does spoil that, but then that is not faith. (3) Their conscience is as conventional as their intellect, and anything such as fear which breaks in upon the routine of their morality, violates their sense of duty. But the conscience of ignorant respectability has no more to do with real morality than it has with astronomy. (4) Their good opinion of themselves is the most absurd and radical conventionality of all, and when fear touches that 'pitiful old self-holiness,' it has gone altogether too far, and the outrage upon self-complacency calls forth the most immediate and violent resistance. There is a magnificent verse which tells us:

> Live out the best that's in thee, and thou art done with fears.

But these ignorant children of conventionality take it for granted that anything that is in them is the best possible, nay the only, way of right living and thinking, and they make short work of fears that they may preserve the *status quo*.

Temporary.

Christian is a shrewd conversationalist, and though he insists on finishing his analysis he does not elaborate it. Hopeful has shown signs of fading interest, and Christian is speaking not to please himself, but to keep his friend awake. So he passes on to 'another profitable question'—but this time it is not abstract, but concrete and personal, that it may appeal to Hopeful's interest more directly. It succeeds from the outset, and leads to a new train of peculiarly fresh analysis of character.

It is to be noted, however, that in this whole part of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the allegorist yields to the preacher, and although Ignorance and Temporary are live men, they are also texts for very able and profitable discourse. Indeed, so much is this the case, and so interesting to Bunyan is the discussion apart from its character-painting, that the allegory here breaks down completely, so far as its consistency as narrative is concerned. One of those rare notes of time is introduced ('about ten years ago') which throw the incident out of all relation to the rest of the story. At that date we have Temporary dwelling in Graceless, which is about three miles from Hopeful's home in Vanity Fair.[1]

[1] It will be observed also that this town bears the same name as Christian bore in the City of Destruction. Macaulay, in his essay on *The Pilgrim's Progress*, discusses this point with considerable fulness.

Temporary consults Hopeful, who pities him and has hopes of him; and Christian also must have been dwelling permanently thereabouts, for the story tells of what is evidently a long-standing acquaintance that had been suddenly broken off. Thus we have Christian a dweller in or near Vanity Fair instead of Destruction, and Hopeful a Puritan religious guide before his conversion. Thus, from the point of view of geography and of history, the story is a hopeless tangle of confusion at this point. But the reason for this is, as Stevenson points out in his well-known essay, the growing intensity of spiritual realities and the fading of earthly interests as the pilgrimage draws on towards its close.

Temporary—rendered by their former personal acquaintance with him when they all thus dwelt near together as vivid a character as if they had met him by the way—is one more phase of Bunyan's pet aversion. Pliable, Timorous, and Mistrust, Turnaway (that 'wanton professor and damnable apostate'), Turnback, are all different varieties of the same type. In *The Holy War*, 'Three young fellows, Mr. Tradition, Mr. Human Wisdom, and Mr. Man's Invention, proffered their services to Shaddai. The captain told them not to be rash; but at their entreaty they even enlisted into Boanerges' company, and away they went to the war. Being in the rear they were taken prisoners. Then Diabolus asked them if they were willing to serve against Shaddai. They told him that as they did not so much live by religion as by the fates of fortune, they would serve him. So he made two of them sergeants; but he made Mr. Man's Invention his ancient-bearer [standard-bearer].' In all these figures we have, as we have said, types of Bunyan's pet aversion. Stevenson used to say, 'I cannot bear idiots': Bunyan would have said, with at least equal gusto and emphasis, 'I cannot bear turncoats.' Even in Apollyon's taunting of Christain with being a turncoat, in the Valley of Humiliation, we can see the bitterness which this vice always rouses in Bunyan's breast. Temporary is indeed a milder type than Turnaway, and the emphasis in his case lies on emotional shallowness and slightness rather than on deliberate apostasy. Yet Bunyan feels himself under no obligation to handle him gently.

It is a curious question what exactly he means by making him live 'two miles from Honesty.' Evidently something is intended, for it is introduced without any other reference to the latter town. Is it to remind us of the worthlessness of sincerity without endurance? or is it to indicate that he was not *quite* honest, though he dwelt in that neighbourhood? or does he mean that Temporary was *not* honest, the only really honest thing being that grace which carries a man through to the end? We cannot tell, but on the whole the first explanation seems the most probable. The good intentions and earnest disposition of the man are clearly indicated, and indeed are almost implied in his very name.

These pitiful triflers with pilgrimage serve to throw up into clearer and more impressive distinctness the splendid *stretch* of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The very imagination of the road—that continuous and uniting bond between the beginning and the end, connecting the City of Destruction with the Celestial City with its unbroken ribbon of white highway—suggests a majestic and courageous appeal for continuance 'unto the end.' Such men as Temporary, with their short-lived enthusiasms, soon broken off and never leading to any goal, are shamed by the very road itself.

That is the literary and artistic side of this matter, but there is a theological aspect of it also. How do such men as Temporary stand related to the doctrines of efficient grace and the perseverance of the Elect? The answer is supplied in the name of Temporary's native town, Graceless. Bunyan believes in the perseverance of the saints, but he sees very many who never had grace, though they thought they had it and were so considered by others. There is no falling from grace here, for Temporary never had it. It is at least an easy and a logical way of resolving a very difficult and subtle question. Bunyan faces the facts of life unflinchingly, and explains them as best he may. His verses on 'An Apple-Tree' are a fuller exposition of this particular subject:

> A comely sight indeed it is to see
> A world of blossoms on an apple-tree:
> Yet far more comely would this tree appear,
> If all its dainty blooms young apples were.
> But how much more one might upon it see,
> If all would hang there till they ripe should be.
> But most of all in beauty 'twould abound,
> If every one should there be truly sound.
> But we, alas! do commonly behold
> Blooms fall apace, if mornings be but cold.

They, too, which hang till they young apples are,
By blasting winds and vermin take despair;
Store that do hang, while almost ripe we see
By blust'ring winds are shaken from the tree.
So that of many only some there be
That grow to thrive to full maturity.

These lines hardly require the somewhat heavy moralizing of the verses which interpret them in the 'Divine Emblems.'

From these deeper questions which the case suggests, but which the story touches on but lightly, Bunyan passes to the still more congenial human aspects, the reasons and the manner of backsliding.

As to the reasons, the first cause of Temporary's change is not mentioned in Hopeful's speech, but in a preliminary remark of Christian's. It was through the acquaintance of one Save-self that the trouble suddenly began. Of course, this companion is allegorical, and stands for that self-sufficiency which is the peculiar note of all Bunyan's turncoats. Yet it is hardly likely that a touch so true to experience as this reference to companionship can be unintentional. Every one who has had any dealing with souls knows only too well how crucial the question of companions is. The friendships of a pilgrim are a matter of life and death importance for his career, and most of the tragedies of desertion are traceable in part at least to some such source. As for the further reasons, and the common manner of backsliding, we must reserve our notice of these for the next article.

Contributions and Comments.

Character.

THE oldest meaning of the verb χαράσσειν, from which the subst. χαρακτήρ is derived, seems to have been 'to sharpen,' 'to whet' (Hesiod, *Op. et Di.* 387: χαρασσομένοιο σιδήρου [cf. 573; *Scut. Her.* 235]); but the idea of 'incising, engraving, indenting' must date from a very early time, although the verb χαράσσειν in this sense is not met with until comparatively late (*e.g.* Erinna, *Anthol. Pal.* vii. 710. 8; Diod. iii. 44. 3, etc.). For the substantive χαρακτήρ was very early used in a figurative sense, derived from the process of minting, as = 'mark,' 'stamp,' 'impression' (*Æschyl. Suppl.* 272 f. [Kirchh.]: Κύπριος χαρακτὴρ τ' ἐν γυναικείοις τύποις | εἰκὼς πέπληκται τεκτόνων πρὸς ἀρσένων [schol. καὶ γυναῖκες ἂν Κύπριαι ἀνδράσι μιγεῖσαι τέκοιεν καθ' ὑμᾶς]; Eurip. *El.* 559: τί μ' εἰσδέδορκεν ὥσπερ ἀργύρου σκοπῶν | λαμπρὸν χαρακτῆρ'; cf. *Med.* 518). It is hardly necessary, therefore, to quote more instances of the literal unfigurative meaning of the word (*e.g.* Aristotle, *Oec.* p. 1349 *b*. 31: ἐπικόψας [*sc.* Dionysius] χαρακτῆρα ἐξέδωκε τὴν δραχμὴν δύο δυναμένην δραχμάς; cf. Diod. xvii. 66, etc.). As early, then, as the fifth century χαρακτήρ means 'distinguishing mark,' 'sign,' 'peculiarity,' 'essence.' Thus Herodotus, i. 57 (cf. 142), speaks of γλώσσης χαρακτῆρα, and we find the same thing in Sophocles (*Fr.* 178 N.), who borrowed so much from him Similarly in Aristoph. *Pax*, 220, we read: ὁ γοῦν χαρακτὴρ ἡμεδαπὸς τῶν ῥημάτων (cf. Diod. i. 8. 4: χαρακτῆρας διαλέκτων). Herodotus also mentions a χαρακτὴρ τοῦ προσώπου (i. 116), not unlike the passage just quoted from Æschylus (cf. also Diod. i. 91; Dio Chr. *Or.* lii. 6. p. 268 [R.]). The word has practically become stereotyped in this sense, which it retains down to the present day. We shall now discuss a few minor modifications.

1. The word χαρακτήρ is very often used to accentuate a certain distinguishing peculiarity, or any special feature (Eur. *Hec.* 379: δεινὸς χαρακτὴρ κἀπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς | ἐσθλῶν γενέσθαι; Plut. *Thes.* 7: χαρακτῆρα τῆς εὐγενείας; [Isocr.] *ad Dem.* 8: εὐδοξίας [cf. Sext. Emp. p. 50. 20 [B.]; Plut. *Quaest. conviv.* 718 *c.*; Epict. iv. 5, 16 f., iii. 22. 80; 2 Mac 4[10]), and is also probably connected with conceptions like μορφή and χρῶμα (Plut. *Phoc.* 3: τούτων δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αἱ ἀρεταὶ μέχρι τῶν τελευταίων καὶ ἀτόμων διαφορῶν ἕνα χαρακτῆρα . . . ἐκφέρουσιν, etc.; cf. Sext. Emp. 554. 27).

2. The notion of χαρακτήρ received a special value and force through a literary work. Soon after 319 B.C. Theophrastus wrote under the title of Ἠθικοὶ Χαρακτῆρες (so the title is given in Diog. Laer. v. 47), that famous book, which, although it exists now only in an epitome, nevertheless contains a wealth of the most ingenious observations concerning the phenomena presented by human beings. The work produces a comical effect only because its observations are so extraordinarily apt.

There are altogether 30 items: (1) Εἰρωνεία, (2) Κολακεία, (3) Ἀδολεσχία, (4) Ἀγροικία, (5) Ἀρέσκεια, (6) Ἀπόνοια, (7) Λαλιά, (8) Λογοποιία, (9) Ἀναισχυντία, (10) Μικρολογία, (11) Βδελυρία, (12) Ἀκαιρία, (13) Περιεργία, (14) Ἀναισθησία, (15) Αὐθάδεια, (16) Δεισιδαιμονία, (17) Μεμψιμοιρία, (18) Ἀπιστία, (19) Δυσχέρεια, (20) Ἀηδία, (21) Μικροψυχολογία, (22) Ἀνελευθερία, (23) Ἀλαζονεία, (24) Ὑπερηφανία, (25) Δειλία, (26) Ὀλιγαρχία, (27) Ὀψιμαθία, (28) Κακολογία, (29) Φιλοπονηρία, (30) Αἰσχροκέρδεια.

This shows us the capability of the ancient thinker to analyze human types, and carefully to distinguish from each other, according to different points of view, features which we would rank in a single portrait (cf., *e.g.*, 2 and 5, 10 and 30). Following, indeed, the example of Casaubon (Θεοφράστου ἠθ. χαρ., Lyons, 1592), it has been held that Theophrastus drew his characters not so much from life as from the stage, and this view is still to be met with everywhere in the history of literature. But although resemblances between the descriptions of Theophrastus and those of comedy are not wanting, we must guard very carefully against a too sweeping generalization in this matter. For, while comedy almost always seeks to caricature, Theophrastus gives a purely objective—one might say a natural science—presentation, without ridicule or satire (cf. H. Reich, *Der Mimus*, 1903, p. 390 ff.).[1]

3. In rhetoric we meet with a special use of the word χαρακτήρ. It merely develops, indeed, the meaning with which we became acquainted above in Herodotus i. 57, etc. Thus Demetrius (*de Elocut.* 36) distinguishes four kinds of style: the ἰσχνὸς, μεγαλοπρεπὴς, γλαφυρὸς, δεινὸς χαρ.; Gellius (vi. 14), three 'genera dicendi . . . quae Graeci' χαρακτῆρες vocant . . . ἁδρόν, ἰσχνόν, μέσον; Dionysius (*ad Pomp.* 4. 1) mentions two kinds of historiography, the πραγματικὸς and the λεκτικὸς χαρ. (cf. also Cicero, *Orat.* 134), and Aphthonius (ii. 45. 15 [Sp.]) offers the following prescription for the expression of character: ἐργάσηι δὲ τὴν ἠθοποιίαν χαρακτῆρι σαφεῖ, συντόμωι, ἀνθηρῶι. . . .

4. Just as with us, the plural of the word was used in ancient Greek in the sense of 'letters' (Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* p. 214 f.: οἱ τῶν γραμμάτων χαρακτῆρες, *de Gen. Socr.* 577 f.: ἴδιός τις ὁ τύπος καὶ βαρβαρικὸς τῶν χαρακτήρων ἐμφερέστατος Αἰγυπτίοις [cf. *adv. Col.* 1120 f.; Diod. iii. 67]).

5. Lastly, from the meaning 'mark,' 'sign,' there arose the rendering of 'scar' by χαρακτήρ in the LXX (Lv 13^{28}, χαρ. τοῦ κατακαύματος).

The above is, in general outline, the history of the notion among the Greeks. From the nature of things, its use in Latin completely coincides with this (cf. *Thesaur. Ling. Lat., s.v.* 'Character'). When the range of the word seems wider among the Romans (in Isidor. *Orig.* 20. 16. 7, *character* is an instrument for marking cattle; in Cass. Fel. 13, p. 20, it is used of the *stigmata*; cf. Ambros. *Obit. Valent.* 58: 'charactere domini inscribuntur servuli,' etc.), this is merely an apparent extension of meaning due to the incompleteness of our Greek lexicons. In every other instance the Greek and the Latin usage is identical. Thus the term *character* is applied to the stamp on coins (*Lib. de asse*, 12); letters of the alphabet (Serg. *Gram.* iv. 176. 15: 'character ejus [digammi] ex duabus gammis fit'; cf. Priscill. *Tract.* 1, p. 26. 8); to magical symbols (Ambros. *Serm.* 24. 6: 'qui confidunt in phylacteriis et characteribus)'; to the external appearance of man (Iren. ii. 34. 4: '[animas] characterem corporis . . . custodire eundem'; Ven. Fort. *Expos. Symb.* 7: '[dei] vere filius est verbum et speculum et character et imago vivens patris viventis'), as well as his inner being (Donat. Terent. *Eun. præf.* p. 269. 11: 'tertius actus characterem exprimit militis et parasiti'); and to the *genus dicendi* (Varro, *de Re Rust.* iii. 2. 17: '[L. Abucci] Luciliano sunt charactere libelli'; cf. Serv. *Ecl.* p. 1. 16 [Th.]; Philargyr. on Verg. *Ecl.* p. 1. 13; Prob. *Ecl. præf.* p. 329. 10: 'omne carmen in tres characteres dividitur: dramaticon . . . diegematicon . . . micton').

J. Geffcken.

Rostock.

[1] The Philological Society of Leipzig produced an excellent annotated edition of Theophrastus' valuable work in 1897; the newest edition is by H. Diels, Oxford, 1909.

The Place of Charity or Almsgiving in the Old Testament.

Charity has always filled a large place in Jewish doctrine and practice. In the O.T. it is repeatedly commended, and receives a wide interpretation. The poor, by which are meant not only the necessitous, but the widow and the orphan, whose bereavement marks them out as especial objects of sympathy, and the 'stranger,' whose friendless con-

dition is an additional plea for tender consideration, are God's clients, who may not be ill-treated or neglected with impunity (Ex 22^{22-27}, Ps 68^5 109^{31} 140^{12}, Job 5^{15}). Solicitude for them is one of His attributes (1 S 2^8, Ps 113^7); and such solicitude, manifested by men, is an *imitatio Dei* (Dt $10^{18f.}$). The memory of the Egyptian servitude, moreover, is to stimulate kindness to the bondman (Dt 16^{12} 24^{22}), and to the poor generally (10^{19}). God's charity is a very implication of His own omnipotence: 'He telleth the number of the stars,' but 'healeth,' too, 'the broken in heart' (Ps 147^3). To oppress the poor is to reproach one's Maker (Pr 14^3). On the other hand, they that consider the poor are 'happy' (Ps 41^1, Pr 14^{21}). The Prophets delight in championing the needy against the rich, who exploit them for selfish ends, or who in any way oppress them. The call to do justice to them forms the most impressive feature in the Prophetic exhortations (Is 3^{14}, Jer 2^{34}, Am $2^{6f.}$ 4^1 etc., Zec 7^{10}).

The O.T. writers, however, clearly see the other side of the question. They perceive the drawbacks and dangers of poverty, and never laud it as the ideal condition. They have no benediction for penury. 'Give me neither poverty nor riches,' cries Agur (Pr 30^8). The Pentateuchal legislation includes some minute and even systematic rules for the relief of the necessitous. The poor and the stranger are exclusively entitled to the 'corners' of the field, the gleanings, the windfalls, and the forgotten sheaf or fruit (Lv 19^{10} 23^{22}, Dt 24^{19-21}), and they have an equal right with the owner to the produce of the soil in the Sabbatical Year (Lv 25^6). They are to share in the tithe of the produce each third year (Dt 14^{28}), and in the good cheer that marks the celebrations of the Festivals ($16^{11.14}$). The advent of the Sabbatical Year cancels their debts ($15^{1ff.}$), and the wealthy are expressly cautioned not to let this ordinance prevent them from lending willingly to the needy ($15^{9f.}$), for 'the poor will never cease out of the land'; therefore charity must be open-handed (v.^{11}). But gifts and loans do not exhaust the Pentateuchal provision for the poor. If an Israelite is forced by poverty to sell his land, his nearest kinsman is bound to redeem it, in default of which the owner recovers it at the Jubilee (Lv $25^{25.28}$ [H]. If he is forced to sell himself into bondage, the kinsman must buy him out (v.^{47}), failing which he is to be offered his freedom after six years' service (Ex $21^{2ff.}$), and the master is warned not to let him go empty-handed, or to grudge him his liberty (Dt $15^{14.18}$). If he elects to remain in service, he is to be set free, with his family, at the Jubilee (Lv 25^{41}). For the Israelites, poor as well as rich, were redeemed from Egypt to be servants of God, not the slaves of men (vv.$^{41.55}$). Thus the poor have their rights. Charity is not to be flung at them disdainfully, or bestowed as an act of grace. Thy 'brother' is to 'live with thee' (Lv 25^{35}); therefore thou must 'uphold him' when 'his hand faileth,' and not let him sink utterly before thou helpest him (*ibid.*). For, essentially, rich and poor are equal, sons of a common Father; 'the Lord is the maker of them all' (Pr 22^2; cf. Mal 2^{10}). It follows that something more is due to poverty than charity in the narrower sense. The poor must be treated with tender consideration. In the conflict between the rights of poverty and wealth, those of the latter must give way. The poor man's garment, taken in pledge, must be restored at sundown, even if the debt it secures be not repaid, for 'wherein shall he sleep?' (Ex 22^{26}, Dt $24^{12f.}$); and, when demanding his pledge, the lender must not intrude into the poor man's dwelling, but must 'stand without' to receive it (Dt 14^{10}). Even the poor man's house is his castle. The tools or implements by which the workman obtains his bread must not be accepted as security; to accept them is to 'take a man's life to pledge' (Dt 24^6). The wage of the hireling, in like manner, is to be paid at the day's end (v.$^{14f.}$); and all loans to the poor are to be free of interest (Ex 22^{25}, Lv 25^{35-37}). Despite, however, this duty of tender consideration, charity was never to oust justice. If the judge was admonished not to honour the person of the mighty, he was equally exhorted not to respect the person of the poor (Lv 19^{15})—a notable example of the sanity of the Pentateuchal ethics. A vivid and beautiful picture of old-time benevolence is furnished in Job $29^{12ff.}$ and $31^{17ff.}$.

London. MORRIS JOSEPH.

The German Excavations at Jericho.

A CORRECTION should be made to this article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxi. 354*b*. In line 13, instead of 'must apparently,' etc., to end of sentence, read 'and located on this wall along its northern face, has been found to belong to a later period.'

E. DE KNEVETT.

Brussels.

Christ's Necessities.

John iv. 4, 'And he must needs go through Samaria.'

To a reverential mind the suggestion of a necessity, limiting and restricting the freedom of Christ in His service for mankind, always brings with it an uncomfortable apprehension of something like detraction from the true dignity of His person and character. For not a little of the worth of that service that He rendered has always been regarded as arising from its entire voluntariness. And that element has generally been assumed to exclude in His case the operation of any and every form of necessity.

And yet in the Gospels Jesus is frequently represented as caught in the grip of necessity (cf. Lk 4^{43}, 'I must preach'; Mk 16^{21}, 'He must go unto Jerusalem'; Jn 9^{4}, 'We must work'). Apparently the feeling of the necessity was peculiar to Himself. Mary did not see that it was necessary for Him to be in His Father's (Lk 2^{49}). Peter did not recognize the necessity of going on to Jerusalem (Mt 16^{22}). No more did the other disciples realize the necessity of encountering the hostility of the authorities there (Mk 8^{32}). And as little did they understand the necessity that He felt that He must be raised again from the dead (Lk 18^{34}). And, indeed, it would seem that, much to its loss, the Church, especially perhaps since the Reformation, has never recognized this necessity as the Apostolic age did, and has thereby given an unbalanced importance to the necessity of the crucifixion.

Now, if the necessity which affected Christ in His work were, as suggested by these observations, rather subjective than objective, and perceived only by Himself, it would not come into conflict with His own will, although it might press heavily upon it, as it certainly did, in the remarkable experience through which He passed in Gethsemane. So that what He did would still be done freely, as He explained of the surrender of His life—'No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself' (Jn 10^{18}).

The sum of the matter, then, would seem to be that, in His progress, occasions arrived which suggested to Him, although not yet to others, something not yet attained or realized by Him, which, however, He was bound of necessity to achieve or to experience, and which the sequence of events would afterwards reveal as the necessity that pressed upon Him.

Thus the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch $2^{17.18}$) describes a necessity that Jesus felt, but which His disciples did not realize. It was necessary for Him to pass through an experience of personal suffering in order to acquire the ability to succour the tempted.

In a shallow, cynical sense, Caiaphas justified the necessity of His death as a means of saving the nation (Jn 11^{50}). Afterwards Paul explained the necessity in another and deeper sense (Ro 14^{9}, 2 Co $5^{14.15}$).

Let us now come back to the necessity noted in Jn 4^{4}, and inquire what light the event shed upon the necessity for going through Samaria. What did Christ obtain or attain through this visit to Sychar?

1. He obtained an experience, apparently the first, of what it was to seek and to save the lost.

2. What was perhaps more essential and more imperatively necessary for Him in the stage of development which He had now reached, He obtained in Sychar the acknowledgment of Himself as 'the Saviour of the World.'

Already at His baptism the consciousness of Heaven's acceptance of His devotion was certified to Him in that revelation: 'This is my beloved Son' (Mt 3^{17}). And in the power of the Spirit He returned into Galilee (Lk 4^{14}).

Again, in Judea, at the Jordan, Jesus had received a certificate of His dignity and authority from the Baptist (Jn 1^{26}); and by one of the Baptist's disciples He was recognized as the Messiah (Jn 1^{41}).

Were these testimonies sufficient to satisfy the mind of One, who had a foreboding of a mission to the world? The concession of prophecy was His. Those who followed Isaiah's Voice in the Wilderness accepted Him, and in Him received power to become and to know themselves sons of God.

But what of His relation to those who had not heard the Voice of prophecy? What of His influence with those who owned no authority in religion after Moses? Would they recognize Him as the Prophet, who should arise like the great lawgiver of the Church? Unless His message proved equally effective among them, there must remain a fatal lack in His adaptation to the world-work before Him. That lack was filled up, and that adaptation was proved, at Sychar. The freedom which He exercised was allowed in the widest

sense. And the Samaritans accepted their place under Him in a world-salvation.

Thus from Judea Jesus returned equipped for His work, not as the Baptist in the spirit and power of Elijah (Lk 1^{17}), but in the power of the Spirit, as yet undefined, but to be manifested in His own life, and to define itself as His, His last gift to His Church, her necessity as His own.

A. Thom.

Tullibody.

Entre Nous.

Alexander Maclaren.

'An interpreter, one among a thousand' (Job xxxiii. 23).

'Nothing is here for tears, nothing to wail:'
So said old England's poet: even so
We say to-day of him beyond the veil,
Whose spirit God has summoned hence to go.

For all is noble: all his voice and pen
Interpreted from heaven; the last and best,
His life's great sermon, ends; its grand Amen
At last is said: God's servant is at rest.

His field was more than aught of England's soil;
His pulpit's base was ever deep and broad;
His field was all the world, wherever toil
The ministers and labourers of God.

They sow the precious seed, and God supplies,
By human hands sometimes, the golden grain;
His hands supplied it. God from out the skies
Sends down in blessing His abundant rain;

And lips of men God wills His channels be.
His lips were touched as from the altar's fire;
From out those lips was heard Heaven's melody,
And now they praise Him in the heavenly choir.

R. L. Jaffrey.

Edinburgh.

Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

Church Quarterly Review, April 1910.

Dr. Hastings' great undertaking may fairly be said to have now established itself as so far original that it cannot be disregarded or neglected by students on the ground that the same information can be obtained elsewhere. They may wish that it were not so expensive (though the volumes can, we believe, be bought by instalments), or fancy that their own special subjects might perhaps have been treated even more fully; but the *Encyclopædia* contains so much—we had almost said 'so much that is unexpected'—and is so admirably edited, that the note of criticism seems out of place.

The Sayings of Muhammad.

Messrs. Constable have published very prettily, a collection of *The Sayings of Muhammad*, edited by Abdullah Al-Mamun Al-Suhrawardy (1s. net). There are no fewer than 1465 collections of the Prophet's Sayings extant, of which the more generally used amongst the Sunnis are the 'Six Correct' collections, and those amongst the Shiahs, 'the Four Books.' We offer four of the sayings:

Ye followers of Muhammad, I swear by the Lord, if ye did but know what I know of the future state, verily ye would laugh little and cry much.

My sayings do not abrogate the word of God, but the word of God can abrogate my sayings.

A man cannot be a Muslim till his heart and tongue are so.

He will not enter hell, who hath faith equal to a single grain of mustard seed in his heart; and he will not enter paradise, who hath a single grain of pride equal to one of mustard seed in his heart.

Arithmetic.

Arithmetic is the title of a chapter in the Rev. R. C. Gillie's *Little Talks on Temperance* (Allenson; 1s.). It contains this riddle. If there are two public-houses, which each do a trade of a hundred barrels a week, and you take away one public-house, what do you have? 'More business for the remaining public-house,' says one; 'Less

drinking in the district,' says another. 'Both can't be right,' growls a third. But the curious thing is that both are right.

It also contains this anecdote: 'A man who had the reputation of being a very hard bargainer, asked his little boy, soon after school had begun, how much twice two was. His son answered, "*Five*!" The father was very angry, and said, "Five, Ikey, five! shame on you to have learned so badly. Try again." Immediately the little boy answered, "Four." "Quite right, quite right," said the father; "now, why did you make that ridiculous mistake and tell me five?" "Because I was sure *you would try to beat me down*."'

George Herbert.

In *George Herbert, Melodist* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net), Mr. E. S. Buchanan tells the short but moving story of Herbert's life, and then estimates his worth for personal piety. He says that in Herbert more than in any poet, except Spenser, we have the union of lyric power with true religion, of poetry with piety. He says that it is of Herbert we think when we read the fine utterance of Browning in 'Mr. Sludge, the Medium':

> Religion's all or nothing; it's no mere smile
> O' contentment, sigh of aspiration, Sir—
> No quality of the finelier-tempered clay
> Like its whiteness or its lightness; rather, stuff
> O' the very stuff, life of life, and self of self.

Lessing's Dictum.

Early Church History, i. 10.

By far the strongest blow yet struck at Christianity is Lessing's *dictum*, that events of time cannot prove eternal truth. Its tone of reverence for the eternal contrasts well with the vulgar clap-trap of, Miracles do not happen now, and attracts a more serious class of thinkers; yet it is at bottom no better logic than the other. It of course carries a direct denial of the claim which the Gospel makes to be a revelation of eternal truth through certain events of time; but its own validity depends on the substantially atheistic assumption that there is no God who guides the course of such events.

H. M. Gwatkin.

Thomas.

Ibid. i. 60.

Dr. Grierson tells me that there is Indian evidence, which ought not to be ignored, in favour of a visit of Thomas to India. On the value of that evidence I am not competent to speak; but thus much seems fairly proved: (1) That if the apostle came to India at all, he would come to the north-west and not to the Malabar coast, and would there meet the king actually named in the legend; (2) that Christianity may have touched India from the side of Bactria in the third century; (3) that Christianity, and in particular its doctrine of the Incarnation, may very well have been one of the factors which shaped the later growth of Brahminism. In this case Brahminism will be akin to Gnosticism, though with the important differences that incarnation, not salvation, is the idea taken up, that it is more subordinate, and that it is quite separated from the historical Christ.

H. M. Gwatkin.

Joy.

Ibid. i. 206.

The Latins could preach righteousness, the mystics peace; but only the Greeks before the Reformation fully understood that the kingdom of God is also joy.

H. M. Gwatkin.

Not mad, Most Noble Festus.

Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers, i. 504.

A gentleman and his wife, one Sabbath, going to church in Glasgow, met a friend who spoke to them, and inquired where they were going. They said, 'To hear Dr. Chalmers.' He said, 'What! to hear that madman?' They said if he would agree to go with them, and hear Dr. Chalmers for once, and if, after that, he persisted in talking in such a manner of him, they would never dispute the matter with him again. He accompanied them; and, singular to relate, it happened that when Dr. Chalmers entered the pulpit that day, he gave out as his text, 'I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak forth the words of soberness and truth'; and the gentleman, who I rather think was a medical man, became from that day a changed man—a convert to evangelical Christianity. I had often heard and related this story without being able to authenticate it, till, on happening to mention it to my friend Dr. Welsh, he told me that he knew it to be *perfectly authentic*, and knew who the party was. I was delighted with this confirmation of the story, as I think it one of the most interesting anecdotes in modern biography.

The Heavings of Incipient Civilization.

Ibid. iv. 462.

Dr. Chalmers had a wonderful store of anecdotes, of which he could avail himself with a happy promptitude, for the illustration of any subject that turned up in conversation, and on such occasions his keen sense of the ludicrous was often evinced with irresistible effect. One evening as we were walking together silently, after I had come to this parish, he was much gratified with the respectful demeanour of the people whom we met, and in particular with the fact (afterwards described by himself in broad Scotch), that 'an auld wife hirsled aff a dyke to mak' her courtesy.' Towards the end of our walk, a person having passed without making any sign of recognition, Dr. Chalmers observed, 'I perceive your people don't all recognize you yet. This brings to my mind a story connected with Buckhaven, which, you know, is a peculiar sort of place. It was long, and is yet, to some extent, behind other places in point of civilization; but some few of the inhabitants got a little in advance of the rest. The minister of the parish went one day to solemnize a marriage; he made the bridegroom, of course, promise to be a faithful, loving, and indulgent husband—at least, he put the question to that effect, but could not get him to alter his stiff erect posture. Again and again he repeated the form, but the man remained silent and stiff as ever. A neighbour was present who knew more about the forms and footsteps of the thing, and was considered to have advanced a little more in civilization than the rest. Enraged at the clownishness of the bridegroom, he stepped forward, gave him a vigorous knock on the back, and said to him with corresponding energy, "Ye brute, can ye no boo to the minister!"' Dr. Chalmers's commentary on this scene was brief but emphatic: 'The heavings of incipient civilization, you know.'

Not Feeling Well.

At a public dinner Mark Twain's name was associated with the toast of literature by an orator who, in the course of his speech, eloquently referred to Homer, Milton, Shakespeare, and—Mark Twain! The humorist, in reply, thanked the speaker for his allusions, and excused himself for acknowledging them at greater length by saying: 'Homer is dead; Milton is dead; Shakespeare is dead; and I am not feeling any too well myself!'

The Apocalyptic Hope and the Teaching of Jesus.

This is the subject of keenest contention at present. There is an article on it in the *International Journal of Apocrypha* for April. It is written by the Rev. Cyril W. Emmet, M.A., and it is right well written.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. G. C. Gould, Kettering, to whom a copy of Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for July must be received by the 1st of June. The text is Rev 22^{14}.

The Great Text for August is Rev 22^{17}—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.' A copy of Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Ps 1^{3}—'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' A copy of Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Adams's *Israel's Ideal*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Ps 4^{6}:

'Many there be that say, Who will shew us any good?
Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.'

A copy of Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, or Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Inge's *Faith and Knowledge*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Ps $8^{3,4}$:

When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform* along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Jewish Quarterly Review*, which began in the year 1888, ended in the year 1908. It was edited by Mr. Israël ABRAHAMS and Mr. Claude G. MONTEFIORE. Out of its ashes have arisen two Reviews, a new *Jewish Quarterly Review*, to be edited by Professor Felix ADLER and Professor SCHECHTER in Philadelphia, and the *Jewish Review*, to be edited by Mr. Norman BENTWICH and Dr. Joseph HOCHMAN, and to be published by Messrs. Routledge & Sons in London.

The first number of the *Jewish Review* has been published. Its most significant article is a review of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S volume on *The Synoptic Gospels*. The review is signed by Mr. Gerald FRIEDLANDER. The signing of reviews is a feature of the number. It does not seem to mean that the editors decline responsibility for the reviewers' opinions. In this instance at any rate reviewer and editors are evidently at one. For in the editorial notes we are told that while the *Jewish Review* is to provide a platform for the discussion of Jewish questions in a critical and scientific spirit, yet 'in its religious views it will be frankly conservative,' and that 'we stand for traditional Judaism.' The reviewer of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S book stands for traditional Judaism.

Mr. MONTEFIORE believes that the religion of the future will be 'a developed and purified Judaism,' upon which Mr. FRIEDLANDER remarks that his exposition of Liberal Judaism 'leaves little to differentiate it from that modern phase of Christianity preached in the New Theology, and known as Unitarianism.' From the developed and purified Judaism which is to be the religion of the future, Mr. MONTEFIORE hopes that the name of 'perhaps the greatest, as certainly of its most potent and influential teacher, will not be excluded.' Mr. FRIEDLANDER will have nothing to do with Jesus.

'We are amazed,' he says, 'by the reverence and affection displayed by Montefiore for Jesus.' And lest Mr. MONTEFIORE or any other should reply that he does not know the Jesus of the Gospels, Mr. FRIEDLANDER proceeds at once to declare his knowledge. 'Montefiore,' he says, 'frequently dwells on the "pity" motive of Jesus.' Mr. FRIEDLANDER does not believe in it. When Mr. MONTEFIORE asserts that 'in this pity, this profound and yearning compassion, there lies probably a true and fundamental characteristic of the historic Jesus,' the reviewer demands proof to support the statement. He refers to Mt $8^{11.12}$, 'And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping

and gnashing of teeth.' In that passage, he says, 'Jesus excludes all the people from the peace and happiness of his kingdom, and without the least pity, sentences them to the outer darkness, to weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

But Mr. FRIEDLANDER'S sorest complaint is that Mr. MONTEFIORE approves of the principle of Jesus that there is 'no such thing as religious impurity in a material sense.' It 'cuts athwart the whole scheme of dietary laws.' It 'abrogates the distinction between clean and unclean which forms an important part of Jewish life.' He calls it an inept principle—'one of the most inept principles in the Gospels'—and he evidently thinks that it will not work. For 'is not drunkenness the curse of England, the cause of nearly all the crime and misery? And yet Mr. MONTEFIORE approves of the saying that there is nothing outside a man, which entering into him can make him unclean' (Mk $7^{15, 18}$).

The *Jewish Quarterly Review* of Philadelphia has not appeared yet. But in the *Open Court* for April there is an article by a liberal Jew which may be set beside the review of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S book. The article is written by Rabbi A. P. DRUCKER, of whom the editor of the *Open Court* says that he is a member of the Conference of American Rabbis and of the Rabbinical Association of Chicago. The title of the article is 'The Old Testament as a Text-Book.'

Rabbi DRUCKER thinks the time has come for both Jews and Christians to give up the Old Testament as a text-book. We have now reached that stage of religious development which was attained by ancient Greece in the days of Plato. It was during the lifetime of this philosopher that the discovery was made that the old myths and stories about the gods were unsuited to the people's advanced philosophical and religious conceptions. We to-day, says Rabbi DRUCKER, are confronted with the same difficulty in regard to the Bible. He holds that we have not only surpassed the teachings of the Bible, but have also outgrown its very conception of God. And he is not afraid to say of the stories in the Bible what Plato said of the deeds of the gods, that 'they corrupt the virtues of the people.'

By the Bible Rabbi DRUCKER means, of course, the Old Testament. Now it may be that only the Jews are bound to defend the morality of the Old Testament. Our Lord's 'I say unto you,' it may be claimed, frees the Christian from the necessity. Yet this is a matter of a little more than curiosity to the Christian. We have joined with the Jews in making the Old Testament a text-book. We retain it as a text-book even in these days of 'advanced philosophical and religious conceptions.' What objection, then, has Rabbi DRUCKER to the God of the Old Testament?

He is jealous, he says, and revengeful. He covets honour and praise. He is even cruel and barbarous. And for illustration he refers to the destruction of the Canaanites, the anger of His prophet Moses at the sparing of the Midianite women, the denunciation of Saul for suffering the king of the Amalekites to live, and the death of Uzzah for steadying the ark.

More seriously, the God of the Old Testament, says Rabbi DRUCKER, is untruthful. 'We read unblinkingly how he bids Moses tell Pharaoh that the Children of Israel are to leave Egypt for a three days' journey only, when in reality he is planning that they shall never return.' He also orders the Israelites to borrow gold and silver vessels, ornaments and jewellery, from the Egyptians under false pretences. And he shows himself 'hardly less vainglorious than untruthful,' for he hardens Pharaoh's heart so that he will not suffer the Israelites to depart, 'for a mere whim, to prove his strength, to show off, as it were.'

Last of all, Rabbi DRUCKER makes the charge that Yahawe (the spelling 'indicates the pronunciation used at the Jewish Theological Seminary of

New York') is depicted in the Old Testament as ignorant of the future. He is so ignorant that he made man, and then when he found out the mistake, sent a flood to exterminate him. And he is ignorant in smaller matters as well as in greater. He sends Saul to be anointed by Samuel, and then repents that he has set him up to be king and sends Samuel to take the kingdom from him.

Well, we have heard all this before. And perhaps we have not been so much disturbed by it as we should have been. But what will the Jews do with it who are 'frankly conservative' and 'stand for traditional Judaism'? What will the Jews do with it who are amazed at the reverence paid to Jesus, and do not know the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool' (Is 1^{18}). The passage is well quoted after an attack on the Old Testament. How many passages in the New have brought as much consolation to sinning men?

But is the passage correctly translated? The latest commentaries on Isaiah are those of Mr. G. H. Box and Professor GUTHE, the former being published independently in 1908, and the latter as part of the new edition of KAUTZSCH'S *Die heilige Schrift des A.T.* in 1909. And both these commentaries offer the translation, first suggested by WELLHAUSEN, which turns the promise into a question.

Mr. C. F. BURNEY discusses the translation of the passage in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April. He quotes the translation of Mr. Box:

Come now let us argue together, says Jahweh:
If your sins be as scarlet
shall they become white as snow?
If they be red as crimson
shall they become as wool?

And he quotes the vindication which Mr. Box offers in a footnote: 'The language of promise and forgiveness is quite out of keeping with the stern logic of a legal plea.'

First, then, is it a legal plea? Mr. BURNEY admits that it is usually understood so to be. But he does not believe it. The case for the court of justice, he says, rests on the one word translated in the Authorized and Revised Versions, 'let us reason together.' This word Dr. SKINNER translates, 'let us implead one another,' and adds: 'The idea is that of a legal process in which each party maintains his own case.' Mr. BURNEY examines the use of the verb elsewhere. He comes to the conclusion that the meaning here is 'let us right ourselves,' which he takes to mean 'let us enter into right relations with one another.'

With this translation the necessity of finding ourselves in a court of justice vanishes. Mr. BURNEY recommends us to rid our minds of the idea of a judgment-scene, and connect vv.$^{18\text{-}20}$ with the passage immediately preceding. Then the opening words of v.^{16}, 'Wash you, make you clean,' will show that the idea of the washing away of sins, even so heinous as those of apostate Israel, is prominent in the prophet's mind.

Nor will Mr. BURNEY allow that so gracious an offer of forgiveness is inconsistent with Isaiah's idea of the character of Jahweh. Certainly Isaiah has conceived the idea that the holiness of Jahweh is awful and unique. But where has he expressed its awfulness most emphatically? It is in that sixth chapter in which he describes his own call and the keen sense of his own sinfulness which the vision of God's holiness produced in him. Now in that passage the prophet's sin is as graciously forgiven, and the word that is used to declare it—'purged' is the translation—contains the same idea of wiping away and making bright and clean as is prominent in the verse before us.

But against the translation which would turn the

promise into a rhetorical query, Mr. BURNEY has another argument. If this is a question, there is no interrogative particle to tell us so. If it is a question, the question is left to be asked by the speaker's tone of voice. Mr. BURNEY does not believe that there is another instance of a sentence such as this, in which a question is left to be asked by the tone of voice of the speaker.

No site in Palestine has been held to be more surely established than the site of Jacob's Well. But the Rev. Asad MANSUR, Pastor of Christ Church, Nazareth, suspects the identification. He has published his suspicion and the reasons for it in the *Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* for April.

His first reason for rejecting the claim of the present well to be Jacob's Well, is that Jacob's Well was near to a city of Samaria called Sychar. Where was Sychar? Some say Sychar is a local corruption of the name Shechem; some say a deliberate corruption to express the intemperance of that Samaritan city, Sychar meaning 'drunken.' Mr. MANSUR believes that Sychar and Shechem are distinct names, but that Sychar was just outside the walls of Shechem, to which it formed a suburb, where wine was pressed or sold, or where public-houses were built.

His second objection is that Jacob is nowhere said to have dug a well where 'Jacob's Well' is now found, and there would have been no sense in his doing so. For there was, and is, plenty of spring water in the neighbourhood, which could be reached without any of the digging that this deep well must have demanded.

His third reason is, even if there was a well in our Lord's day where the present 'Jacob's Well' is found, the woman of Samaria was not likely to pass all the other excellent and accessible wells in order to draw water from it. Mr. MANSUR is aware that this objection has been met in two ways. It has been suggested that the woman was at work in the fields and came to Jacob's Well as nearest, to get water both for herself and for those who may have been working in the field with her. To that Mr. MANSUR replies by pointing to the season of the year. It was yet four months till the harvest, and as the harvest begins in the middle of April, the time was the middle of December. What could the woman be doing in the field at that season? And even if she were in the field and at work,—though what the nature of the work could be, no one can tell,—still there would be no need for a rope and water-jar to find water then. A small jar filled from a house or from some fountain on the way would be sufficient at that time of year both for herself and for any others who might be with her.

The other way to meet the objection is to suggest that Jacob's Well was a sacred well. The woman may in her piety have passed all the other wells purposely in order to draw water from this well with its sacred associations. To which Mr. MANSUR replies that this woman's character before her conversion is well known to us. He cannot conceive that she would feel more respect for a holy place than other women in her town.

His last reason is that the present 'Jacob's Well' is probably not a well at all, and never could have served the purpose either of Jacob or of the woman of Samaria. Mr. MANSUR does not believe that the present Jacob's Well is more than a cistern. It is dry in summer, and the water that is found in it in winter drains into it, he believes, from its sides. 'When I was in Nâblus in the month of March, I was told that the monks bring the water to the well from the village of Askar.'

Mr. MANSUR'S own opinion is that the well at which our Lord conversed with the woman of Samaria was in the north of the city of Shechem. Opposite to that quarter of the present town of Shechem, which is now known by the name of *Ḥâret el-Ḥableh*, there is an opening in Mount

Ebal, with gardens and fields. 'I feel much inclined to reckon this opening as the parcel of a field which Jacob bought and in which he dug the well. There are several springs in the *Ḥâret el-Ḥableh*, and wherever you dig to a depth of fifteen feet or even ten, the water springs up in a copious fountain. There is a well here called the Well of the Prophets, on which a Muhammadan mosque has been built, called *el-Anbia* ('the prophets'), and by the word 'prophets' the Muslims mean 'the sons of Jacob.' I venture to believe, then, that if Jacob dug a well in the neighbourhood, it is to be identified with this well or some well near it.

There are sermons for undergraduates, and there are sermons for others. But even the undergraduates who listened to the sermon preached by Professor Inge before the University of Cambridge, and published in the *Guardian* for May 13, must have been gratified by the compliment paid to their penetration. The subject of the sermon was the apocalyptic element in Christ's teaching.

It is the most difficult subject to handle in all the range of Apostolic Christianity. And its difficulty is at its greatest. It is, as Professor Inge calls it, 'the storm-centre of Christian apologetics at the present time.'

The early Christians looked upon the Ascension as little more than the necessary preliminary to their Lord's return. In the words of Professor Inge, it was 'the penultimate scene of a drama which was very shortly to have its *dénouement* by the reappearance of the Messiah on the clouds of heaven.' This is a fact which, however unwelcome, we must face. And recent critics of Christianity are determined that we shall face it, together with all that follows from it. But while this is one fact, there is another fact which also has to be faced. If the coming of Christ is represented in the New Testament as immediate, it is also represented as dim and distant, the end (if the end at all) of a long, slow process of growth.

Nothing, says Professor Inge, but our uncritical manner of studying Holy Scripture could have hidden from us so long the double thread which runs, entangled but not united, through the New Testament. On the one side, we have the whole scheme of salvation presented to us under the forms of time and place. The place is Judæa. The time is the generation of men then living. God's final interposition—the 'coming' of Christ—is to be external, sudden, violent, wholly miraculous. And it is bound up with certain beliefs about the structure of the universe. The earth is, as it were, the first floor of a three-storied building. Jerusalem is the centre of the earth. And the end of all things is at hand.

On the other side, there is a Kingdom which is in this world but is not of it. Christ is the Head of it. The indwelling Spirit of Christ is its guiding star. It passes through a long probation as a Church militant, its practice based on the counsels and the example of its Head. And salvation is the attainment of eternal life—that is to say, of a higher state of existence, beyond this bourne of time and space, a blessed state to be fully realized in the future, but which in a measure may be realized on earth.

We are now told that Christianity began with the former of these conceptions, and ended with the latter. 'All through St. Paul's Epistles we can trace the gradual evanescence of the crude Messianic belief, and the approximation to the spiritual religion which we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in a still more advanced form in the Fourth Gospel.'

And Professor Inge does not deny that this is so. But the serious aspect of the matter is seen when it is further asserted that our Lord Himself knew only the former conception of the Kingdom. It is asserted that Jesus 'never contemplated founding a Church or instituting a rule of life for future generations; that His one message was "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand"—or, in

modern language, that the world was coming to an end. He went about warning His countrymen of an impending catastrophe, in which all existing conditions would be subverted, and a supernatural Messianic reign established.'

Now, if this view of the preaching of Christ is accurate and adequate, Professor INGE is not mistaken when he says that Christianity is 'torn up by the roots.' For these predictions were falsified in every particular. And the same critics allow us to claim very little else as His authentic teaching. 'It is true that there are some Christians, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, who do not regard this treatment of our Lord as intolerable. I confess,' says Professor Inge, 'that I can neither agree with their arguments nor understand their position.'

But both conceptions are there. And they are contradictory. How does Professor INGE propose to resolve the contradiction?

Well, in the first place, he will not allow us to retain the lazy belief into which we have fallen, that Christ promised to return to the earth at a far distant date, which was unknown to Himself. It is true, we are told that the day and the hour were unknown; but the predictions, as they stand in our documents, clearly assert that the return, or 'coming,' of the Son of Man was imminent. He will not allow us, therefore, to say that the disciples simply antedated the fulfilment of the prophecy and that it still holds good. Professor INGE then uses these serious words: 'Our Lord is recorded in the Gospels to have made predictions which certainly have not been, and cannot now be, fulfilled—predictions, moreover, which, if they were an essential part of His message, must have profoundly modified the whole of His practical teaching, making it only suited to the brief interval before the end of all things should come.'

So there is no doubt about the difficulty of the subject. How does Professor INGE propose to deal with it? It was when he proceeded to his proposals for dealing with it that the undergraduates who listened to him must have recognized the compliment which was paid to their penetration. If they were students of psychology, that might have made it easier for them to follow. Professor INGE considers the subject mainly from the psychological side. For he thinks that the solution of the problem must be found in that region. He begins with John the Baptist.

John the Baptist preached a moral preparation for a supernatural catastrophe. So did Jesus. Indeed, He used identical language. But note the difference in meaning. Jesus had a doctrine of Fatherhood. John had not. By means of His doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, Jesus was able to make His preaching of repentance and the imminence of judgment a message of mercy and of hope. John preached judgment to come, pure and simple. He had no way of connecting moral amendment with the impending catastrophe so as to change the centre of gravity from fear to love. Jesus also urged repentance in view of the imminent end. But the repentance He preached was the first step in a life of filial obedience and joy.

Whereupon the Jewish apocalyptic ideas began to lose their force and to pass away. The apocalyptic language was still used. But it was now only the husk: Jewish Messianism was shattered from within. The disciples did not see this at once. They knew that some great change was taking place. Their minds were filled with a great hope, a dazzling, blinding hope, which only grew stronger after the tragic end of the earthly mission. Their Master was restored to them. He was with them still. The Kingdom of God was creating itself in their hearts. They felt that they were living in the very hour of the fulfilment of prophecy, and they could use, and did use, the old familiar language, but they used it with a new meaning. 'When a man is possessed by the

Spirit of God, and feels all heaven within him, he may use the language of his childhood about the gold and jewels of heaven's streets, and the winged messengers of the King; but assuredly his faith is not childish or materialistic.'

But is there any evidence that the disciples did not use the common apocalyptic language in the common sense? There is the evidence of result. By their fruits ye shall know them. We know the apocalyptic type of religion. It is a real type. It exists. 'Its normal results,' says Professor INGE, 'are either political insurgence or selfish quietism—in either case indifference to social morality, neglect of duties, nervous excitement, and rapid evanescence.' Is this the religion of the follower of Christ? Is it the religion of Christ Himself?

But when Professor INGE has vindicated the spiritual character of the religion of Christ and His disciples, he proceeds at once to admit that in the teaching of Christ and in the teaching of His disciples there are passages which are purely apocalyptic in character. And he admits that their apocalyptic character is not in the language merely, but in the thought. His explanation is to cut the knot. These passages are misinterpretations of Christ's actual teaching on the part of His disciples, or they are later interpolations. 'Very few critics,' he says, 'accept as authentic the apocalyptic prophecy in Mk 13: may there not be one or two more innocent interpolations of the same kind?'

This is a little disappointing. But the truth is better than our pleasure. If it is so, let us see that it is so. It is still more disappointing, perhaps, to find Professor INGE admitting 'the further possibility that our Lord in becoming man may have been willing to share, to some extent, the current popular delusions both with regard to the Messianic hope and to demoniacal possession.' But he insists that this concession must certainly not be stretched so far as to admit that He fancied Himself filling the rôle of Daniel's 'son of man' in the near future. 'Such a notion would not be compatible with sanity, far less with those attributes which all Christians believe Him to have possessed.'

The Alleged Catholicism of the First Gospel and its Date.

BY THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., LECTURER IN THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE IN THE UNIVERSITY, AND ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

IT seems to be universally believed that the First Gospel reflects a fairly advanced stage of ecclesiastical development. And it is in consequence as universally believed to be comparatively late in date. Professor Peake, *e.g.*, argues against some who date it not much later than the year 70 A.D., 'that the Gospel seems to reflect a somewhat later period of ecclesiastical development. Nothing forbids the view that this rather Catholicised Gospel may have been written towards the close of the first century.'[1] Now, that the book does represent a certain stage of Church development is certain. What is uncertain is the date to which the Gospel must be assigned in consequence. The Church may be said to have begun its career from the moment that the disciples realized that their Master had left them to preach the gospel. At what stage in its future development must our First Gospel be placed?

I propose to state in the following pages the evidence which seems to me to make it abundantly clear that the book cannot have been written after the Fall of Jerusalem, and that it may have been

[1] *Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 123.

written some years earlier. The question is an important one; indeed, I believe it to be the most important point at issue in the whole so-called Synoptic Problem. It affects our conceptions as to the character of Christ's teaching, the Q question, and perhaps the date of the Second Gospel.

1. The conception, which dominates the whole book, of the kingdom of the heavens as a kingdom to be inaugurated in the *near* future when the Son of Man returns on the clouds of heaven, suggests an early rather than a late date. In St. Paul's later Epistles, in St. Luke and St. John (Gospel), this emphasis on the *nearness* of Christ's coming has been lost, and other conceptions have taken its place of honour.[1] But in the First Gospel the thought of *immediacy* clothes the whole book like an atmosphere. It is to be the burden of the Apostolic preaching (10^{7}). And the preachers will not have gone through the cities of Israel ere the Son of Man had come (10^{23}). The author is so full of it that he reads it into his Marcan source; *e.g.* 'the kingdom of God come with power' becomes 'the Son of Man coming in his kingdom' (Mt 16^{28}). That 'coming' is coincident with 'the end of the age' (24^{3}); and both will take place immediately after the fall of Jerusalem (24^{29}), and within the lifetime of that generation (24^{34}). The high priest and his colleagues were to see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven (26^{64}).

Now the modern reader is strangely blind to this apocalyptic keynote of the First Gospel. This is probably due to many causes, perhaps most of all to an unwillingness to believe that Christ taught what is here put into His mouth. But the immediate question is not, 'Is there here a right and impartial reflexion of Christ's teaching?' but 'Did the Evangelist so conceive Christ's teaching or not?' To this there can surely be but one answer. The Evangelist lived in the hope that Christ would speedily inaugurate His kingdom, and if words have any meaning at all he thought that the Lord had promised to return on the clouds of heaven in order to effect this inauguration.

It may, however, be said, 'Is there not much teaching in the Gospel in which a longer perspective of history is, if not plainly portrayed, at least visible in the background of thought?' The teaching here referred to is—(*a*) the reference to a preaching to the Gentiles; (*b*) the parables; (*c*) the teaching which implies as a background the community of Christ's disciples as a distinct society obeying Christ's law.

I will deal with the Gentile question and the teaching to the community later on. As regards the parables, it is quite true that some of them might reasonably be so interpreted as to give an impression of the kingdom as a present factor in the world, destined to endure for an indefinite period. So, *e.g.*, the Tares and the Wheat, or the Mustard Seed. But a little reflexion will show that any idea of duration of time which they suggest is purely relative, and that the kingdom, so far as these parables taken by themselves are concerned, is or may be almost anything that the reader chooses to make it, from the Catholic Church to the doctrine of Christ's imminent Parousia. It is of course possible that the Gospel consists of a number of sayings apparently contradictory in tenor, which the Evangelist did not know how to reconcile, but which he recorded simply because they were traditional sayings. But this is very unlikely, because the Evangelist in all probability has made only a selection out of the material available to him, and might have avoided ambiguous sayings or teachings contradictory to others which he was recording, of which the meaning is clear. The simplest and most reasonable view of the Evangelist is that he had certain tolerably clear conceptions of the meaning of Christ's life and teaching, and has selected material to illustrate those conceptions. If that be the case, a readiness to interpret 'the kingdom' of the parables in the light of 'the kingdom' elsewhere in the Gospels ascribes to the Evangelist some reasonable consistency and clearness of view, and relieves the Gospel of the reproach of being a kind of commonplace book of unassorted and inconsistent sayings. But if the kingdom of the parables be the

[1] Dr. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. 367, argues that the language of Mt 24 need not cause us to date the Gospel before the year 70 A.D., on the ground that the author can quite well have left unaltered expressions of his source. But this misses the whole point. Not only does the Evangelist leave unaltered expressions of the sources which he had before him for ch. 24, but he does alter, *e.g.*, Mk 9^{1} (cf. Mt 16^{28}), in order to bring into that passage the same idea of the nearness of the Parousia, which runs through the whole Gospel. In other words, it is not only the author of the discourse source, but also the Evangelist himself who wishes to teach that idea. Now, considering that in this Gospel the Fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia are closely connected, it is very difficult to suppose that the writer composed the book long after, if at all after, the Fall of the city.

kingdom of the rest of the Gospel, it is clear that in them as elsewhere the kingdom is conceived of as relatively near, within, that is to say, the lifetime of Christ's disciples.

2. If the conception of the kingdom is an early one, so too is the conception of the Church. It is very astonishing and not very creditable to modern criticism that of a book which is permeated from beginning to end with Jewish particularism, modern scholars, because they twice find in it the term 'ecclesia,' should say, 'Lo, the Catholic Church, this book must be very late!' And yet the uncatholic or rather pre-catholic conception of the writer shows itself everywhere.

The disciples of the Messiah are to keep the Law. Not one of the least of its commandments was to be superseded ($5^{18.\ 19}$). The 'righteousness' which they were to aim at was to be not less than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, but more; that is to say, more profound because it was based upon a deeper understanding of the intention of the Old Testament (5^{21-48}). But all the commandments of the law were still in force. The Evangelist makes this very clear by thrusting into Mk 10^{1-12} a saying reaffirming the sanction of divorce which was traditionally based on Dt 24^{1-2}, and by changing the import of Mk 7^{14-23}, first, by omitting the words *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*; and secondly, by adding words which suggest that Christ's teaching in this section of Mark have nothing to do with removing the Mosaic distinctions between meats clean and unclean, but rather are concerned with the Rabbinical doctrines of purification (Mt 15^{20}). The Deuteronomic law of the two witnesses is still in force (18^{16}), so too is the law of the Sabbath (24^{20}).

Of course it follows that in the mind of the Evangelist the disciples of the Messiah must be Jews or proselytes. And here we come to the attitude of the Gospel to Gentiles. Nothing can be clearer. The Messiah Himself had set an example here. When a Canaanite woman had come to Him from heathen territory and begged His aid, He had told her that His mission was not to Gentiles, but to the house of Israel (15^{24-26}). And in accordance with this He had expressly bidden His disciples go neither to Samaritan nor Gentile ($10^{5.\ 6}$), but rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Of course such teaching did not prevent a heathen from joining the community of Christ's disciples, if he were willing to keep the law. Had not Gentiles always been welcomed to Judaism on such terms? And the disciples of the Messiah now represented the true Judaism. This community of law-keeping disciples of the Messiah are separated from the mass of the Jewish people, and especially from the Scribes and Pharisees who persecute them by (*a*) their belief in the Messiah, (*b*) their truer insight into the Law, (*c*) their belief in the coming kingdom. Consequently they form what the Pharisees would have described as a sect, but what they themselves regarded as the true kernel of the Jewish nation. The Jewish authorities by their attitude to the Messiah had disinherited themselves. They were the 'sons of the kingdom,' *i.e.* those who ought to have inherited it; but they would be cast out (8^{12}). The disciples of the Messiah now remained as the 'sons of the kingdom' (13^{38}).

And separated as they were by their Messianic views from the mass of their compatriots, Christ's disciples had their own simple organization. They regarded the twelve Apostles as their rulers. In the coming kingdom these twelve should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (10^{23}). For the other leaders of their simple organization they retained Old Testament or current Jewish terms: they were prophets or wise men or scribes (23^{34} 13^{52}). Of course they regarded themselves as a community or society. What Aramaic term they used we do not know. Probably there were several. 'Israel' may have been one, 'synagogue' perhaps was another, God's 'nation' (21^{43}) may have been a third. The writer of the First Gospel twice speaks of an 'ecclesia.' Writing in Greek he could hardly have done anything else. In the second passage (18^{17}) he quite clearly means whatever local body of Christians the offended party belonged to. In the first (16^{18}) he no doubt has in mind the whole body of the Messiah's disciples. From the moment of the resurrection to the day when Christ's disciples began to regard themselves as a community or society or body or corporation separated from their fellow-countrymen by their Messianic beliefs need not have been a long period. The first definite acts of persecution at Jerusalem would mark the change. And whether for a local group of Christians, or for the several groups regarded as one body in relation to the Messiah, ecclesia was for one who wrote in Greek the only natural term, as St. Paul's Epistles amply testify.

But are there not passages in the Gospel which show that the writer, in spite of all that has been brought forward, is a Catholic Christian for whom the strife about the admission of Gentiles into the Church is already a thing of the past?

And here I would urge as a reasonable proviso, that if there be isolated passages of doubtful purport they ought to be interpreted in accordance with the general line of thought running through the Gospel, and not unnecessarily be so interpreted as to give a meaning which will introduce chaos of thought into the book. There is, in the first place, the saying $8^{11.12}$ which the author has placed in the story of the centurion's servant. The 'sons of the kingdom,' *i.e.* the official Jews are to be excluded from the kingdom, whilst many are to come from east and west and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of the heavens. The modern commentator jumps to the conclusion that, by the many, Gentiles are intended, and this is possible. The centurion is regarded as a type of a large class who will enter into the kingdom, whilst those who ought to have inherited it, or who regarded themselves as its rightful inheritors, will be thrust out. But there is nothing here inconsistent with the main idea of the Gospel that the kingdom is destined for the true disciples of the Messiah, who must be law-abiding people. The strictest Pharisee never found himself able to exclude Gentiles from the privileges of Judaism. And the Old Testament, the charter of Pharisaism, is full of passages which foretell the inclusion of Gentiles in the privileges of Judaism. It is perfectly clear that the strictest Jewish Christian might be whole-heartedly opposed to the Pauline policy, and yet might accept these words of the Messiah without any misgiving. The 'many from east and west' would not trouble him. If he thought of Gentiles, he would interpret at once as proselytes, or think of Jews of the Dispersion as opposed to the spiritually blinded official classes at Jerusalem. The main point was that they were to sit with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom; and a kingdom with the Jewish Messiah as its king and the Patriarchs as its leading citizens could cause no misgiving to the most sensitive Jewish Christian.

Another and more difficult passage is Mt 21^{43}, where it is said that the kingdom of God will be taken from the chief priests and elders (cf. v.[23]), and given to a nation (ἔθνει) which produces its fruits. This verse is inserted by the author as a sort of commentary on Mk 12^{9}, where it is said that the vineyard will be given to others (ἄλλοις). It is, in the first place, clear that by ἔθνει the author is not thinking of the Gentiles primarily, or he would not have used the singular. The contrast is not between the Jews as a race and the Gentiles as another race, but between the Jewish authorities who have forfeited their right to be called God's vineyard or true Israel, and those people who being the true disciples of the Messiah are really His people. ἔθνος here, therefore, denotes spiritual quality, not racial privilege. And, if Gentiles are not excluded, they are not in the mind of the writer as included. If he had been asked who formed this ἔθνος, he would no doubt have answered all who were disciples of the Messiah and kept the Law and looked for the kingdom.

There remain two passages, and only two, where the Catholicism of the author will seem to the average reader clear and speaking. Let it be said once again, that we are not now concerned with the original meaning of these words, nor with their meaning as interpreted by us in the light of history, but with the probable interpretation put upon them by the author of the First Gospel when he incorporated them into his book. The author, as we have seen, was one who believed that the Messiah had reaffirmed the claims of the Mosaic Law upon all His disciples. Could one who so believed have written these words?

The first is Mt 24^{14}, 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony among all nations.' The author is borrowing from Mk 13^{10}, but he finds it necessary to qualify St. Mark's words. 'The gospel' becomes 'this gospel of the kingdom'; 'to all nations' becomes 'among all nations'; and the important qualification 'for a testimony' is added. Now it is clear that the author supposed that this preaching 'for a testimony' could be accomplished within a generation (cf. 16^{28} 24^{34}). What he meant by 'for a testimony' remains obscure, but it will be in harmony with the entire scheme of his gospel if we suppose him to be thinking of the Jews of the Diaspora. Amongst all such 'the gospel of the kingdom' must be preached, that they and any Gentiles who would keep the Law might have opportunity of enrolling themselves as disciples of the true Messiah and waiting for His kingdom. But whatever 'amongst all nations for

a testimony' may mean, the key to the whole verse clearly lies in the words 'this gospel of the kingdom.' Now, in the light of the whole book, that phrase can mean nothing but the 'gospel of the kingdom as expounded in this book,' *i.e.* 'the good news of the coming back of the Messiah upon the clouds of heaven to inaugurate a kingdom into which all His disciples shall enter.' And, as we have seen, His disciples are they who keep the Law as the Messiah bade them.

And the remaining passage is 28^{19}, 'make disciples of all nations,' μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. There is nothing necessarily Catholic in the later sense of the word here. The Pharisees had always regarded it as a duty, if not a privilege, to make disciples of all nations. 'They compassed,' says this Gospel, 'heaven and earth to make one proselyte.' 'Raise up many disciples,' say the men of the great synagogue, in the *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*. 'Love mankind,' says Hillel in the same book, 'and bring them nigh to the Torah.' It all depends, of course, upon the meaning we put into μαθητεύσατε. What I am concerned with here is the fact that the strictest member of the Jewish Christian party might have believed the words to have been uttered by the Messiah, and yet have fought hard against the Pauline heresy of introducing uncircumcised Gentiles into the new Israel.

I have tried to show that if we do not insist on forcing Catholic meanings into some of the words of the First Gospel against the general tenor and meaning of the writer, there is no Catholicism there. On the other hand, the doctrine of the immediacy of the kingdom throws the book back into the period before the Fall of Jerusalem, whilst the author's view of the permanent validity of the Law, and the consequently narrowed scope of Christianity would admirably fit in with a date about (shortly before or after) the Council at Jerusalem.

Let me now throw out some provisional and conjectural suggestions as to the date and provenance of the book. It is possible that it was written (*c.* 50) at Antioch by some one who agreed with the views referred to in Ac 15^{1}. In favour of Antioch rather than Jerusalem is the fact that the Gospel is written in Greek, not in Aramaic or Hebrew, and that it is based upon a Greek St. Mark. The doctrine of the kingdom, the doctrine of the Law, the attitude towards the Gentile world, all seem to favour such a date; and the fact that the writer is a Jew, probably a Hellenist Jew, writing in Greek, and using Greek sources, including the Septuagint version, favours the place. We might then regard the Gospel as the strongest case that could be made out of Gospel material for the Jewish Christian position. It was impossible to show that the Messiah had commanded that all Gentiles should be circumcised, but it was possible to show that He had laid upon all His disciples as a necessary obligation the observance of the law. And it was possible to show that He had by example and precept deprecated the breaking down of barriers between Jews and pagans (15^{24} and 7^{6}), where it is probable that 'dogs and swine' are for the Evangelist equivalent to Gentiles.

But it will be said, 'Is not the relationship between the First and Second Gospels decisive against so early a date?' I feel much hesitation upon this point, but I think that the answer should be a cautious No. I have long felt that the tradition which points to Rome as the home of the Second Gospel, and which suggests, therefore, a date later than 60 A.D. for the Second Gospel, may be justified by some final revision of the Gospel at Rome after that date, but cannot explain the first publication of the Gospel. For myself I believe in an ultimate Aramaic original, and I see no reason why such an original should not have appeared before the year 50 A.D. The Gospel might well first have appeared in Greek about that period, and then have been used by the author of the First Gospel.

Another objection to so early a date for St. Matthew is urged by Dr. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. p. 368. He argues that St. Luke's Gospel must be dated *c.* 80 A.D., and that the First Gospel cannot have been written more than a few years before that date, because St. Luke must have known of it soon after its publication, and could not have avoided using it. I must not here enter into the date of St. Luke's Gospel. Let us allow that it was written *c.* 80 A.D. St. Luke, then, it is argued, must have known of the First Gospel, and must have used it. Both statements seem to me to be too dogmatic, but I think it probable that both are true. But in view of the Jewish-Christian character of the First Gospel, who can wonder if St. Luke, the Pauline Universalist, having read it, laid it aside among the many other

Gospel narratives that he had read. St. Luke had much to record. He certainly did not wish to repeat the anti-Jewish polemic which occupies so large a place in the First Gospel, and he already had in other forms most of the Lord's sayings which are in the First Gospel and which were adapted to the purpose of his own work.

It may be noted that Harnack seems inclined to reopen the question of the date of the Lucan writings and of St. Mark. See his *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 294 and 296. I think it probable that critical opinion will shortly move in the direction of, say, 60 A.D., as suggested by Harnack, for the Third Gospel, and 50 A.D., or shortly before, for the first publication of a Greek Second Gospel.

Harnack on the Recently Discovered Odes of Solomon.[1]

By the Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, M.A., D.Sc., D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in the New College, Edinburgh.

It is not many months since Dr. Rendel Harris published the *editio princeps* of the Odes of Solomon which he was fortunate enough to discover in a late Syriac MS. from the neighbourhood of the Tigris. A perusal of the book was bound to convince scholars that a remarkable addition had been made to ancient religious literature. And now Professor Harnack, speaking with unrivalled knowledge of the facts, declares that since the discovery of the *Didache*, thirty years ago, nothing so valuable as this has come to light (p. v). The *editio princeps*, it need scarcely be said, was an admirable piece of work, but it was inevitable that further study of the Syriac text would elucidate difficulties both of translation and of interpretation. Such is unquestionably the result of the new edition. Flemming's translation has brought clearness into many obscure places, and, in our judgment, Harnack has made as important a contribution towards the true estimate and explanation of the Odes, as that which he gave to the world many years ago in his classical edition of the *Didache*.

The absence of historical allusions in the Odes makes the question of the date a difficult one. But two or three facts are clear. A quotation from Ode 19 in Lactantius and the presence of five of the Odes in the *Pistis Sophia* make it evident that they were regarded as canonical considerably before the middle of the third century. That would push back their origin, at latest, to the middle of the second century. But an allusion in Ode 4 to the Temple, in which reference is also made to a rival sanctuary (perhaps several?), justifies Harnack in assuming that the Temple was still standing when the Ode was written. This seems more probable than the suggestion of Rendel Harris that it was the destruction of the rival Temple of Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt, in 73 A.D., which called forth the protest of the fourth Ode. Accordingly, the *terminus ad quem* must be placed somewhere before 70 A.D. On the other hand, according to the *Pistis Sophia*, the *Synopsis Sanctae Scripturae* of Pseudo-Athanasius (cent. 6), the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (cent. 9), and Harris's Syriac MS., the Odes formed one book with the famous Psalms of Solomon, which are placed before them by all but the last-named authority. We know that the *Psalms* of Solomon belong to the time of the Roman invasion of Judæa under Pompey. Hence, the *terminus a quo* for the Odes is probably about 50 B.C. It is universally agreed that the Psalms of Solomon are products of Palestinian Judaism. This, at least, raises the presumption that the Odes, which have been combined with them to form a single collection, are of Jewish and Palestinian origin also.

At this point there emerges an important difference of opinion between the two editors. Rendel Harris holds that 'the writer, while not a Jew, was a member of a community of Christians, who were for the most part of Jewish extraction and beliefs, and the apologetic tone which is displayed in the

[1] *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert.* Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von J. Flemming. Bearbeitet u. herausgegeben von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910. Pp. vi, 134.

Odes towards the Gentiles, as a part of the Christian Church, is only consistent with the very earliest ages, and with communities like the Palestinian Churches where Judaism was still in evidence and in control' (p. 87). It is plain to every reader that the Odes, as they stand, contain distinctly Christian elements. Reference is made to the Son, to the Incarnation, to the Virgin-Birth, to the Cross, to the *Descensus ad inferos*. But a careful examination shows that several of the Odes (notably 4 and 6) are certainly Jewish. A second large group reveals no essentially Christian features. How are the facts to be accounted for? Harnack, with real insight, as it appears to us, argues for the hypothesis that the original collection of Odes was purely Jewish, and that it was worked over by a Christian interpolator, who introduced Christian references and terms of thought, but in such a fashion that the insertions, as a rule, can be more or less plainly detected. His acute investigation of Ode 7 is an excellent illustration of how the interpolations may be removed from the text without seriously affecting the progress of the thought. Indeed, again and again, it is this operation alone which makes the context intelligible. But he frankly admits that Odes 19 and 27 are purely Christian, probably the work of the interpolator, although he is not certain that all the Christian elements spring from one source (p. 118).

Harnack's hypothesis is not a mere daring speculation, but one which is supported by a very remarkable parallel in the literature of later Judaism. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs present the same phenomena. Here also a fundamentally Jewish work has been revised and Christianized in parts by a Christian interpolator. In both cases the interpolations are sometimes obscure, because they are clothed essentially in the style of the original (p. 77). But not only does the *form* of the *Testaments* afford a striking parallel to the Odes, but also the character of their thought. The Odes reveal a more fully developed phase of a strain of religious thought in later Judaism, whose earlier stages may be traced in the Testaments. Harnack, from this standpoint, would place them between the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the *Johannine* literature. We must dwell for a little on this point. The Odes, and in a lesser degree the Testaments, do not belong to the main stream of Jewish religion. They embody a sort of mystic individualism. And this character belongs not only to the Jewish original, but to the Christian revision. That is to say, there are marked affinities between the piety of the reviser and that of the circle or author (Harnack, like Harris, inclines, on the whole, to one main source) from whom the Odes have come. 'There speaks in them a mystic, who sees his Ego redeemed . . . and raised to the eternal through the revelation and knowledge of God and by means of the most intimate relationship of love towards Him, a man also who feels that it is his function, as a messenger of God, to communicate to others that which he has experienced' (p. 86). Harnack makes a most impressive collection of characteristic features from the Odes which sets in clear light the religious individuality of the Psalmist (p. 91 f.). He finds the keynote of his thought in such an utterance as that of Ode 26. 10: 'Who may so rest in the Highest, as to speak directly out of His mouth?' (p. 59). Harnack justly discovers foreshadowings of the singer's religious attitude in some of the Canonical Psalms (p. 92). In view of these, it is surely an exaggeration to say (in an important note denying the existence of Gnostic elements in the Odes, p. 103) that this real participation in the being of God through union with Him is not 'a deduction drawn from the ordinary Jewish religion, but springs from foreign influences.' Of course everything here turns on the precise meaning of 'the ordinary Jewish religion,' but the intimate fellowship with God which finds expression in many of the Psalms is surely at least a legitimate development in the light of experience of prominent elements in the religion of the Prophets. When we examine the remarkable expressions of the religious self-consciousness of this 'mystic prophet' in the Odes, we are not surprised that a Christian of later date (Harnack argues for 'about 100 A.D.') should have interpreted them in a Christian (Messianic) sense, and inserted additions to emphasize that interpretation.

Of quite peculiar interest are the leading conceptions of the Odes in their original form. Among them occur χάρις, πιστεύειν, γνῶσις, ἀλήθεια, φῶς, ὕδωρ ζῶν, ἀγάπη, ζωή, of course in a Syriac dress (although Harnack gives reasons for holding that they go back, through a Greek translation, to a Hebrew or Aramaic original, p. 105). Here we are at once reminded of the Johannine writings.

Rendel Harris has discussed the connexion briefly (pp. 73, 74), and sums up with the statement: 'I think it will be conceded that we are in a Johannine atmosphere.' Harnack deliberately asserts that in the Odes we come upon 'the presuppositions of the piety and theology of John . . . apart from any Messianic doctrine' (p. 99). The importance of the phenomenon is that in these writings we are confronted by a type of Jewish religion which stands apart from Hellenic speculation, and yet flows into the same channel as that of Greek philosophy. In the one case, 'everything depends on the ordering of God, in the other on the nature of spirit.' 'Here,' as Harnack most suggestively observes, 'it is true, as in the case of many linguistic phenomena of the Hellenistic period, that there are Hellenisms which are also Semitisms' (p. 100). In these words there is opened up a vista of far-reaching discussion. Harnack declines to dogmatize on the circle to which this author belongs. But he ventures to say that 'John, before he became a Christian, may have been a Jewish mystic like the author of our Odes. To him he is most closely related. They possibly spring from one circle' (p. 106). Now, in a sense, the Christian interpolator has attempted to do what John actually did, to bring this remarkable mystical individualism into direct connexion with Christ. But his attempt was mechanical. 'John has fused the Synoptic Christ with this religion of Light, Love, and Life, and placed its basis in Him' (pp. 99, 100). Harnack has carefully examined the Christology of the interpolator, and regards it as belonging to the main stream of Christological development in the Church, having nothing essentially Jewish-Christian or Gnostic about it, closely connected with Palestinian soil, and scarcely to be placed later than the end of the first century. Its type 'is closely akin to the Johannine; indeed, one must ask whether he did not know the Gospel of John. In the light of Ode 41, that is for me highly probable. I merely hesitate to affirm that it is certain' (p. 110).

Enough has been said to indicate the profound interest and importance of Harnack's discussion. We have not referred to the very valuable detailed commentary on the Odes, which no student of them can afford to neglect.

Literature.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG.

The sixth and seventh volumes have now been issued of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net each). They contain respectively 505 and 502 pages in double column. And as each column contains an average of nearly 500 words, each volume contains about 500,000 words. It means much writing and much editing, and it is well worth the guinea charged for it.

Still it is not so good as the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, each volume of which contains about 1,250,000 words.

After a short account of the Inquisition, with a good bibliography, the first article of importance in the sixth volume is that on 'Inscriptions.' It is condensed from Dr. N. Müller's article in the German edition. Again the bibliography is good so far as it goes, but it has not been brought up to date. The late Dr. H. Cremer's article on 'Inspiration,' after abridgment, has been supplemented by Professor David S. Schaff and Professor C. A. Beckwith. Then comes the first article of the kind for which the Encyclopedia is likely to be most frequently referred to—an article on the German sect called 'The Inspired.' It is curiously out of proportion to the greater topics round it, but we rejoice in its length and interest. The article on the 'Intermediate State' is only a column in length, with references to Eschatology, Probation, and Future. Then comes an article on 'Interpolations in the New Testament' which could have been saved, a cross-reference being made to the article on the text. After a little we come to the article on 'Isaiah,' which is signed by Professor James A. Kelso.

And this article reveals at once the strength and the weakness of the book. For the articles on Bible topics are generally well done and of con-

siderable length; but how easily and how gladly could we have spared them all in order that space might be found for a fuller treatment of topics belonging to the Church. A Dictionary of the Bible is in every one's hands now, and with articles of greater fulness and authority than it is possible for those in this Encyclopedia to possess. If a Dictionary of the Bible had been taken for granted, and the whole space in these twelve volumes used for the history of the Church subsequent to the close of the Canon, how great would have been the value of this Encyclòpedia.

The article on 'Jesus Christ' is in two parts. The first half has been written by Professor Warfield of Princeton, the second half by Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale. Professor Bacon is one of the most conscientious scholars of our day. His critical position is an advanced one. This is what he says of the Transfiguration: 'Parallel to this prose statement is the apocalypse or "vision" story of the Transfiguration, interjected by Mark in 9^{2-10} from some Pauline source of the symbolic type represented in John. Jesus was "metamorphosed" (cf. 2 Cor 3^{18}) before the eyes of Peter, James, and John into his glorified form, while the translated "witnesses of Messiah," Moses and Elias, stood beside him. The voice of God then declared his true character. This again, it need hardly be said, belongs to the history of Christological doctrine; not to the story of Jesus.' Professor Bacon ends his article with the crucifixion. There is one short paragraph after the words, 'Friendly but unknown hands accorded him hasty burial.' This is the paragraph:

'Such is the career whose outline critical analysis dimly discerns beneath the tradition of the Church. The vindication came, though not as Jesus expected it. The throne to which he had not aspired was given him by the love and faith of humanity. There was a "turning again" when the influence of Jesus, whether by the reaction of memories of the past, or in direct spiritual intervention from the unseen world, reawakened the faith of Simon Peter and Christianity began, founded in devotion to the risen and glorified Lord.'

In the seventh volume one of the most satisfactory articles goes under the title of 'Lutherans.' A large proportion of the volume is occupied with personal names, as it covers most of the letter M. It begins the second half of the whole work, and brings the alphabet down to 'Moralists.'

HUNGARY.

In 1878 the Hungarian Academy of Science invited Professor Henry Marczali of Budapest to write a History of Hungary in the time of Joseph II. and Leopold II. (1780–1792). He accepted the invitation, and resolved to make the work as reliable as thorough investigation and sincere desire to keep clear of prejudice could make it. The first edition appeared in 1882, and was immediately succeeded by a second. An edition in English has now been published, made from the Hungarian by Professor A. B. Yolland of Budapest. The work covers only the twelve years named, but the English edition contains an introductory essay on the 'Earlier History of Hungary,' which enables the publishers to give the book the title of *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). The introduction is written by Mr. Harold W. V. Temperley, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse.

It is quite likely that this introductory essay will be to many Englishmen the opening into a fresh field of study. For Hungary is not well known among us. It is farther away than China or Japan. And it will be a surprise to find that the history of Hungary is after all so human and near. It will be a further surprise to learn that some of the great problems of history were of necessity faced in Hungary, and can be seen there in clear significance, not without the presence of sacrifice and tragedy. There is, above all, the great problem of how an uncivilized nation is to adopt civilization and not lose its own nationality. This problem was the great fascination which drew Professor Marczali to the study of his native land in the period assigned him, and carried him through all his laborious preparation. And this is the problem which gives world-wide interest to his work.

We see the reality of the conflict most clearly when we come to the chapter on the Church. 'For several centuries,' says Professor Marczali, 'the distinction between the two conflicting religions which had the greatest political importance and the deepest consequences was that the Catholics clung to the dynasty, which remained true to the old faith. Since the Protestants considered that this alliance imperilled their political and religious liberty, the latter party looked rather to the Turks for support. They were just as little desirous of Osmanizing Hungary as the Catholics

were of Germanizing it, and their situation is, after all, best explained by their relations to the Emperor and the Sultan. Consequently (though the statement may seem open to question), while a large part of the nation professed the Protestant faith, and by its energetic opposition saved the constitution and, perhaps, the nationality of Hungary, none the less the influence of the Catholic Church harmonized more with the historic development of the nation. The most glorious traditions of her past called upon Hungary to fight against the infidels, for she had won her place in the history of the world by such struggles in the past. Everywhere else, indeed, it was natural and almost necessary that the interests of the weaker Protestantism should be identified with those of Islam, the foe of Christianity; but in Hungary the alliance with the Turks at a time of constitutional and religious struggle involved a denial of the nation's past and future. It is this fact that accounts for the tragic fate of men like Bocskay and Gabriel Bethlen, who were the leaders not only of their party but of their nation; they could achieve victories, excite enthusiasm, and command devotion, but they were never able to revive the whole energy of the national spirit.'

But the pursuit of the subject would carry us too far. It is enough to add that the book is one of the utmost scientific value, and that the translation is one of no less artistic value.

A NEW SHAKESPEAREAN DICTIONARY.

The best commentary on Shakespeare was written by a German—Gervinus. The best dictionary of the language of Shakespeare was also written by a German—Schmidt.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. It is not that we have not men who are fit to write commentaries and compile dictionaries. It seems to be that we have not people enough to buy them. A man must give his lifetime to such a work, and no publisher can guarantee that his life's work will not be wasted.

But after Schmidt comes Cunliffe. Mr. R. J. Cunliffe has prepared *A New Shakespearean Dictionary* (Blackie & Son; 9s. net). It is in one volume to Schmidt's two. That seems the utmost that we can attain to. But it is a work of first-rate ability, superseding Schmidt in everything except the examples. Mr. Cunliffe has had the use, for a large part of the alphabet, of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and the advantage of other books issued since Schmidt appeared, especially Bartlett's *Concordance*. And he has made excellent use of all his materials.

What is a Shakespearean Dictionary? It is a dictionary of all the words that are used by Shakespeare in a sense that is obsolete or not quite obvious. Some of the words are actually out of use. But it is not for them that a dictionary of Shakespeare is most necessary. It is for words that have slightly changed their meaning. Many of them make good sense in the modern meaning, and then the dictionary is most necessary of all. Mr. Cunliffe gives some examples: 'travelling *along* this coast'; 'last scene of all, That ends this strange eventful *history*'; 'they are *generally* fools and cowards.' All the words in these examples are quite familiar. They seem, taken as a modern writer would use them, to give a good sense. Unless he is on his guard, the reader is likely to take this as the true sense. But if the words in italics are turned up in the dictionary it will be seen that the sense which the author intended to convey is very different.

It is a delightful book to read. Take the word *occupy* by chance. It occurs ten times in the Authorized Version. In Shakespeare it occurs but twice. For it had come to be employed by vulgar people in a nasty sense, and Shakespeare could not use it, of which, indeed, he makes complaint. Dr. Murray tells us that outside the Bible he has found only eight quotations for the word throughout the seventeenth century, though he found 194 quotations for the sixteenth century. Why has the Authorized Version as many as ten examples? It is partly because the Authorized Version was the heir of the Versions that went before it. But not entirely; for, once at least, it takes the word from Cranmer, though it had not been used by Tindale. Probably the translators of the Authorized Version were not so familiar with the word in its objectionable sense as Shakespeare was.

Do revivals come before they are wanted? The wind bloweth where it listeth. And yet it is subject to law. He maketh the winds His messengers, and He is a God of order. Revivals do not come

before they are wanted. I would, but ye would not.

Do revivals come when they are wanted? That is another matter. But if they are wanted earnestly enough, if they are wanted persistently enough, in the way of giving Him no rest? And then when they come the result is so unexpected and overwhelming that they are felt to be a fulfilment of the promise, 'Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear.' There are men in Scotland who are praying for a revival of religion now, praying earnestly and persistently. And some of them think they already hear the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees. They are recalling the last great revival just fifty years ago. They have published a volume entitled *Reminiscences of the Revival of '59 and the Sixties* (Aberdeen: The University Press; 2s.; paper covers, 1s. 3d.). It is a book to be read. Not for the human side of it, as if the same men must come again with the same figures of speech; but for the Divine side of it, to encourage faith that the same God will come again with the same mighty power to save. Yet on the human side it is full of interest. There are many portraits. They are portraits of large, powerful Scotchmen. Who could have supposed them capable of so much emotion and self-forgetfulness?

Here is a scene, and a comment on it, taken from a new life of *Lancelot Andrewes* (George Allen; 3s. 6d. net), written by Mr. Douglas Macleane, M.A. Better than any words of a reviewer, it will convey an impression of the author's attitude and experience. With the quotation it will be enough to say that Mr. Macleane has made himself thoroughly familiar with Andrewes' time as well as Andrewes' temper. And he is able to make his knowledge ours.

'It was in such a hotbed of controversial factiousness that Andrewes spent seventeen years of his early manhood. What were his own leanings? He had been brought up at school by a "warm Protestant." At Cambridge he was attracted to the devotional side of Calvinism, and is said to have united with Knewstubs, Chaderton, Culverwell, and others of that way of thinking, in weekly meetings for prayer and expository exercises. Chaderton was the first master of "the pure house of Emmanuel," founded in 1584 by Mildmay, who caused the chapel to be built north and south, and Ezekiel Culverwell was of the same society. Aubrey has a rather malicious story about its members. He says:

"The Puritan faction did begin to increase in those dayes, and especially at Emanuel College. That party had a great mind to drawe in this learned young man, whom if they could make theirs they knew would be a great honour to them. They carried themselves outwardly with great sanctity and stricknesse. . . . They preached up very strict observing the Lord's Day,—made damnation to breake it. . . . Yet these hypocrites did bowle in a private green at their colledge every Sunday after sermon; and one of their colledge (a loving friend to Mr. L. Andrewes) to satisfie him one time lent him the key of a private back dore to the bowling green, on a Sunday evening, which he opening, discovered these zealous preachers, with their gownes off, earnest at play. But they were strangely surprized to see the entry of one that was not of *the brotherhood*."

The saints and precisians were giving English folk the spirit of heaviness in lieu of the garment of praise; but I doubt if hypocrisy—which begins with self-sophistication—was as yet a prevailing note of Puritanism. Aubrey was a seventeenth-century royalist and High Churchman. After all, hypocrites do not count. It is the people in earnest who make history, for better or for worse. And all religious movements have an aspect which may be called in the higher sense puritan or evangelical. Certainly Tractarianism had such a side.'

After nearly completing the 'Bible for Schools and Colleges,' the Cambridge Press began a companion series on the 'Revised Version for the Use of Schools.' In this series volumes have been published on the New Testament books from Matthew to Philemon. The first volume of the Old Testament has just appeared. It is *Isaiah, i.–xxxix.* The editors are the Rev. C. H. Thomson, M.A., and the Rev. John Skinner, D.D. (1s. 6d. net).

In the study of this commentary, the thing that most impresses one is the amount of work that has yet to be done in *translating* Isaiah, even after the Revised Version. Take Is 3^{16} as an example: R.V., 'The daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet'; Thomson and Skinner: 'The daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and ogling with their eyes: with tripping steps they walk, and with their feet they make their anklets tingle.'

Besides the notes there is an introduction of thirty-five pages, which might have enriched a Dictionary of the Bible.

The little book is the *multum in parvo* of commenting, and every sentence has been written by a scholar.

The Roman Catholic Church does not seem to be afraid of the historical study of religion. A series of penny pamphlets has been published by the Catholic Truth Society, entitled *C.T.S. Lectures on the History of Religions.* The latest is *The Religion of the Avesta*, by Professor A. Carnoy of the University of Louvain. It is easy reading, and yet altogether trustworthy.

Four-and-twenty years ago, the Rev. John Telford, B.A., published a *Life of John Wesley.* It has been selling all the time. Now he has revised and enlarged it (Culley; 3s. 6d. net), and sent it out as a kind of forerunner of the great life which is coming. Wesley no longer belongs to the Wesleyans. The time is at hand when every Englishman will be as familiar with his life as with the life of Samuel Johnson, and every Scotsman as with the life of Scott.

'The Methodists themselves,' said J. R. Green, 'were the least result of the Methodist Revival.' So we may say that Christians are the least result of Christian Missions. We are led to believe it by the reading of a volume entitled *The Kingdom without Frontiers*, by Thomas Moscrop (Culley; 3s. 6d. net). It is a survey of the evangelical missions of the world. It is a book of great comfort and consolation. For the writer believes that if, on the one hand, there are some who, having named the name of Christ, do not depart from iniquity; on the other hand, there are many who through the preaching of the Gospel have conspicuously departed from iniquity without having named the name of Christ. It is a clear case for the application of the text, 'He that is not against us is on our side.'

It is an encouraging book in many ways. Another way is its frank recognition of the fact that we shall not have attained to the fulness of the mind of Christ until we have made room in our Christianity for all that is genuine in the faith of the Hindu, as well as for all that is genuine in the faith of the Hebrew. It is a process, as Mr. Moscrop says, which some are afraid of, lest the crown should be Christ's no more; but it is a process, as he goes on to say, leading to a stronger and a richer Christian apologetic, which will greatly glorify Christ and crown Him indeed with many crowns.

The new volume of the works of Friedrich Nietzsche in English is the thirteenth. It contains *The Genealogy of Morals* (Foulis; 3s. 6d. net), translated by Mr. Horace B. Samuel, M.A., together with the fragment on 'Peoples and Countries,' translated by Mr. J. M. Kennedy. It is a good volume to begin the study of Nietzsche with; for we suppose he must be studied. Only let no one begin the study too soon. If the study of Job precedes, we shall not be greatly afraid. If the study of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians precedes, we shall have no fear at all. This is one of the easiest of the books to read. The translators have made it easier in the English than in the German.

There is no doubt in the mind of Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson, B.A., that the time is come for a great united furtherance of the Kingdom in the world. Her faith is quite reasonable, but it is none the less faith, and none the less likely to beget faith in others. Her book, of which the title is *The Expansion of Christendom* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), is in a way a history of Protestant Missions, but it is less than that and more. It is no systematic complete history. Countries and men are left out at will. But then it is informed with a spirit which few histories have—a spirit, as we have said, of faith and reason. And, above all, it is a strong encouragement. Seeing that so much has been done, seeing also that so much has to be done, let us lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel. If we were to try to put its significance into a sentence, we should say that the book is an expansion of Carey's great saying: 'Do great things; expect great things.'

For nearly twenty years, Samuel G. Smith, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Head Professor of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in the University of Minnesota, has been a teacher of Sociology. During the same time he has been a teacher of the Bible. One day it occurred to him that Sociology and the Bible might be taught together. Until

that day he had taught Sociology to the upper classmen in the University, and the Bible to special classes in connexion with the People's Church of St. Paul. He began to teach them together, to selected companies of students; and then he boldly announced that he would teach 'Biblical Sociology' to his classes in the University. Part of the course thus taught has been published under the title of *Religion in the Making* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

How has it fared with Sociology? It has fared well. Its materials have been taken from the Bible, and they have been varied and abundant. How has it fared with the Bible? It has fared no worse. Hitherto work of this kind has been done by ethnologists chiefly. And when the ethnologist found a custom elsewhere which bore a strong resemblance to something in the Bible, he thought he had rendered the Biblical fact of no special importance. The study of Biblical Sociology has rendered such a Biblical fact of more importance than ever.

But how does it fare with revelation? The Biblical Sociologist is equally opposed to the supernaturalist who holds that all the knowledge and worship in religion came from an active God to a passive man, and to the naturalist who holds that religion is the product of an active man working upon material in his own heart and brain. The Sociologist holds that the revelation of God could never surpass the capacity of the man to whom it came; and yet it was God's gentleness (or reverence, as Professor Smith translates it) that made man great.

Dr. Horace Grant Underwood of Korea was chosen to deliver the fourth course of the Charles F. Deem's Lectures. The previous courses were delivered by Principal Iverach, Professor Bowne, and Principal Fairbairn. The fifth will be delivered by Sir W. M. Ramsay. Dr. Underwood chose as his subject *Religions of Eastern Asia*. The course is now published by Messrs. Macmillan (6s. 6d. net).

The Religions of Eastern Asia are Taoism, Shintoism, Shamanism, Confucianism, and Buddhism, and Dr. Underwood has given a sketch of each of these religions according to the very latest knowledge. The Shamanism he describes is of course the Shamanism of Korea; the Siberian and other varieties have to be taken by themselves. Then, in the last lecture, Dr. Underwood, being a missionary, brings these forms of religion into direct and detailed comparison with the religion of the Old and New Testament. The conclusion is that the one distinct and unique thing in the Bible is revelation. 'Sooner or later the world will learn that religion is not a creature of civilization, nor of evolution worked out by a gradually developing animal, but a matter of inspiration, "that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God."'

An exceptional number of able men have edited the Epistle to the Hebrews. There are Westcott, Davidson, Vaughan, Bruce, Rendall, Dale, Murray, and more, without touching on the books which have appeared in series. To their number must now be added the Very Rev. E. C. Wickham, D.D., Dean of Lincoln, who has edited that Epistle for Dr. Lock's Westminister Commentaries (Methuen; 6s.).

Dr. Wickham's purpose is that which was already before the mind of Dale and of Davidson—the purpose of making the general argument of the Epistle clear, and exhibiting it as a whole. How difficult it is to do that by means of the ordinary footnotes no one knows better now, we should say, than Dean Wickham himself. He has not given up the ordinary footnotes. But he has striven hard to prevent the explanation of occasional phrases from becoming those proverbial trees which hide the wood. At the beginning of every section he has given a summary of the argument, and he has attached it to the section that goes before. Then at the end of the section he has a frequent and much fuller note in which he takes the opportunity of tracing the progress of thought, and even, occasionally, of expounding the theology.

But we like Dr. Wickham best of all, and he is at his best, when he is hunting after the significance of some word which has now lost its edge for us. Such a word is *kosmikos* in 9^1, translated in A.V. 'worldly,' and in R.V. 'of this world.' What does he think about it? He is not quite settled in his own mind, but he would like to translate the word 'beautifully ordered.' Thus: 'Now the First Covenant had a sanctuary, a sanctuary which was beautifully ordered.'

Messrs Morgan & Scott have a 'Golden Treasury' series, it seems, as well as Messrs. Macmillan. It consists of reprints (at the price of 1s. net each) of certain books which have already done well in

a more expensive form, and still continue selling. Ten volumes are published, three of which have been noticed already. The seven which remain are Bogatzky's *Golden Treasury*; Saphir's *Christ and the Scriptures*; Meyer's *David*, *Joseph*, and *Paul*; Culross's *John*; and Scott's *The Catacombs at Rome*. The last volume is illustrated.

'Father Tyrrell, less than a year before his too early death, speaking of Modernism in America, said: "I cannot understand America. With its freedom and intelligence, its representatives ought to be in the forefront of the Modernist movement. Yet Modernism has produced there hardly an echo. The Church in America is asleep; and I can conceive nothing that will awaken it but the production of some book native to the soil, which will raise so loud a cry of reform that all who have ears must hear."'

That book has now been written. It has been written in the form of *Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X.* (Open Court; 5s. 6d.) The author's name is not given. For he writes with a severity that is amazing, and it would not be prudent for him to sign his name to his letters. He writes of celibacy, for instance, in a way to make a Protestant wonder.

'The sole possible reason,' he says, 'for retaining celibacy is the belief that unholiness, uncleanness, and a kind of degradation are inseparable from marriage. The literature of Roman Catholic asceticism, the words of Hildebrand and Peter Damianus who did so much to enforce the present discipline, and even the brief quotations given in the first part of this letter from Gregory XVI. and Pius IX., prove this abundantly. Because the priesthood is clean, it can have nothing to do with marriage, which is dirty. There is the real Roman argument, notwithstanding that Rome considers marriage a sacrament. This constant and disgusting preoccupation with the merely physical, this inability to regard the higher offices of wedded life, we are certain to discover in every Roman reasoning upon this subject. Such an attitude is Manichæism, a survival of heathen taboo, a relic of one of the worst superstitions that ever misled mankind. Besides, it is hardly less than a blasphemy against the Author of nature, not a single knowable expression of whose will is favourable to the idea that marriage is debasing, and celibacy intrinsically the higher state of life.'

But that is not a singular quotation. If his Holiness reads the letters he will not read them without emotion.

For the *practice* of the Lord's Prayer, we do not know a better encouragement than a volume entitled *Our Father*, written by the Rev. J. R. Cohu, and published by Messrs. Parker of Oxford (2s. 6d. net).

Character is the most difficult thing that any man is set to make. It needs all the advice and encouragement that experts can provide. The Rev. Henry W. Clark is an expert. His book of *Studies in the Making of Character* (Robert Scott) costs little and is worth much.

The name of M'Cheyne is one of perpetual spiritual fragrance in Scotland. If of any Scottish saint, it may be said of M'Cheyne that 'he being dead yet speaketh.' The books which have been written of him are many. Here is another, *Robert Murray M'Cheyne*, by Mr. J. C. Smith (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). It is written out of a full heart and under the spell of sacred memories. It is illustrated with pictures of M'Cheyne's work and person.

Under the title of *The Church of England as Catholic and Reformed* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. W. L. Paige Cox, M.A., discusses questions of reunion. He describes his book as 'An Exposition and an Eirenicon,' and he describes it truly. There have been writers of 'eirenicons' who used the word so that it was difficult for any one to use it afterwards. Let no Nonconformist fear a trap in Canon Paige Cox's use of it.

Yet Canon Paige Cox believes wholly in the Church of England. The way to reunion, he says, is for the Presbyterians to play their proper part. That is to say, let them first bring Congregationalists over to an acceptance of those Catholic principles to which they themselves have adhered, and then let them all go together to the Church of England, 'as a body claiming to be purely Scriptural and Catholic in all its distinctive features.'

The Theosophical Publishing Company of New York has issued a new translation of the Fourth Gospel. Messrs. Luzac & Co. have imported the book into this country. The translator is Mr.

James M. Pryse, who tells us quite frankly that his purpose is to bring out the hidden meaning behind the language. Are we not told that 'all these things Iêsous spoke to the people in parables, and without a parable he did not speak anything to them'? The teaching, therefore, had an inner and concealed meaning, divulged only to the few who were worthy to receive it. The translation is in modern English, but a great many words are used which modern English has not yet received. The title of the book is *The Magical Message according to Iôannês*. Here are some examples of the translation:

Jn 1^{1}. 'In a First-principle was the [uttered] Thought, and the Thought was in relation to The God, and the Thought was a God.'

1^{14}. 'And the Thought became flesh, and encamped among us; and we beheld his Radiance, a Radiance as of a [son] born of one [parent] only (from a father), full of Grace and Truth.'

8^{44}. '*You* are from the Accuser's Father, and the longings of your Father you will to go on doing. *He* was a man-slayer from a First-principle, and did not keep his place in the Truth, because there is no Truth in him. When he speaks the False, he speaks from his own; because he is a falsifier, and [so is] *his* Father.'

The volume has an introduction of essays on the Seen and the Unseen, the Drama of the Soul, etc., together with a series of footnotes explaining those Greek words which have an esoteric meaning. Thus at the verse 18^{3}, 'Ioudas, therefore, having received the company of soldiers, and retainers from the archpriests and Pharisaians, comes there with lights and torches and weapons,' there is a footnote to 'company of soldiers': 'Gr. *speira*, a body of men-at-arms. But the primary meaning of the word is "a spiral," "a coil," and here it is a word-play referring to the spiral Fire of the Paraklêtos—called in Sanskrit the *kundalini*, or "coiled-up" force.'

What is it that hinders some people—so many people—from believing in the life beyond death? Dr. Newman Smyth says it is their imagination. It is not excess of imagination, nor defect of it. It is because their imagination has not been cultivated in this direction or exercised to this end. There are those who can vividly realize the England on whose shores William the Conqueror landed, or the Rome upon which Marcus Aurelius looked out with his sad eyes, who yet are quite unable to make out anything reliable 'beyond the veil.' Their imagination has been cultivated on its historical, but not on its spiritual side.

This, then, is the encouragement to be found in a little book entitled *Modern Belief in Immortality*, originally a Lecture given on the Drew Foundation at Hackney College, and now published by Mr. Fisher Unwin (3s. 6d. net).

The *Free Church Year Book* is issued by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, and may be had at the Memorial Hall, London, E.C. (2s. 6d. net). It is divided into three sections: first, an account of the Fifteenth National Council; next, the Federation Report; and third, Free Church Information. It is a volume of varied interest, as the phrase goes. There are, in the first place, several sermons; and they are of sufficient value to make a volume of sermons successful even if it cost more money than this volume costs. Then there is theology—theology which is unhesitatingly evangelical and is expressed with unhesitating emphasis by Dr. P. T. Forsyth. There is devotion also—three penetrating short papers by the Rev. W. Redfern, Mr. W. R. Lane, and Principal J. T. Marshall. And, of course, there is the information about the Free Churches which no other volume contains.

Anthropos, one of the greatest of all anthropological periodicals, has reached its fifth volume. Each bi-monthly number is a handsome quarto of about 300 pages. Its contents appear partly in German, partly in French, and partly in English. In the first number of the current volume the articles in English are 'Likenesses to the Story of Moses in Central Africa Folklore,' by Fr. J. Torrend, S.J.; 'The Twelve Lunar Months among the Basuto,' by Justinus Sechefo; 'The Great Déné Race,' by Fr. A. G. Morice, O.M.I.; and 'Noun Composition in American Languages,' by Dr. A. L. Kroeber.

The likenesses to the story of Moses are striking enough to make the author, a good anthropologist, believe that the story is one of world-wide prevalence. He dismisses the idea of Christian teaching. And the resemblances, if occasionally surprising, are after all scarcely close enough for that.

Anthropos costs 15s. a year. The office of publication is St. Gabriel-Mödling bei Wien, Austria. Any bookseller will supply the magazine.

Dr. Paul Feine on the Apocalyptic Teaching of Jesus.

By Professor the Rev. J. G. Tasker, D.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham.

The publication of Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, and of the English translation of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, has forced into prominence a question of which all careful N.T. students have felt both the difficulty and the importance, namely, 'The Apocalyptic Element in our Lord's Teaching: Its Significance for Christian Faith and Ethics.' In the last sentence use has been made of the programme for the Church Congress which meets next October in Cambridge; for in this form the subject is down for discussion. Reviews of Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* have rightly directed attention to his avowed 'onesidedness' in forcing the Gospels into accord with his view that in the teaching of Jesus the eschatological element is primary; the negative character of his results has also been commented upon by critics of all schools of thought. The problem is ably dealt with in the most recently published Handbook of New Testament Theology.[1] Its author is Dr. Paul Feine, favourably known by his earlier work, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, as a scholar at once modern in his methods and positive in his conclusions.

The first part of Feine's work is entitled 'The Teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptists,' and the references in this article will be to chapter v., 'The Kingdom of God,' and chapter viii., 'The Ethics of Jesus.' All that can be attempted is to indicate the author's position in regard to subjects now in the forefront of the discussion. As regards the different forms of expression used, 'The Kingdom' is treated as a *terminus technicus* used without further definition because the context makes its meaning plain (Mt 25^{34}, Lk $22^{29f.}$). Jesus also speaks of *His* Kingdom, thus showing that He was conscious of His calling as Messiah (Lk 22^{30} 23^{42}). The Jewish people saw the coming of 'the kingdom of our father, David,' when they saw Jesus make His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. In later Judaism 'heaven' was a possible substitute for 'God' in certain phrases; its employment arose from hesitation to utter the Divine name. The phrase, 'the kingdom of heaven,' may be due to Matthew's adoption of this usage, but it is also possible that Jesus Himself spoke of the kingdom of heaven, and that in the sources which underlie Mk. and Lk. the expression was avoided as likely to be misunderstood by the Greeks, to whom, without an explanation, it would not be intelligible.

In the section which deals with the origin of the phrase, 'the kingdom of God,' in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature, stress is laid upon the substitution in the Targums of abstract expressions referring to the Divine dominion for the Biblical descriptions of God as the King of Israel. His rule belongs to this æon; His dominion is upon earth, although His kingdom has no spatial limitations. The transcendent God manifests Himself in the world. This is the faith of Jesus, but He departs from the Jewish Messianic hope in that He looks for the ideal kingdom of David, that is to say, a spiritual, and not a political kingdom. The description of the kingdom in the Book of Daniel influenced Jesus; He adopted the title 'the Son of Man,' and the conception of a kingdom in which God's will should be supreme. Hence His teaching that the time had come for the establishment of the eternal kingdom; it was the kingdom of heaven, because it was the rule on earth of Heaven's eternal King.

In the teaching of Jesus Feine discovers no warrant for the contention of extremists who maintain that the kingdom of God is to be understood *either* eschatologically *or* ethically, and that if these two points of view are not mutually exclusive, the eschatological or supernatural is primary and dominates the religious or the spiritual. 'Both groups of expressions are found in the Gospels, and to neither may violence be done in the interests of the other.' Passages are examined in which Jesus speaks of the kingdom, sometimes as future, and sometimes as present. On the one hand, the kingdom is to come with power in the immediate future; 'the whole faith of the early Christians in the speedy ushering in of the kingdom of God would be inexplicable, unless it had

[1] *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Von D. Dr. Paul Feine, ordentlichem Professor der evangelischen Theologie an der Universität Breslau. Pp. xii, 714. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

some foundation in definite sayings of Jesus.' On the other hand, He claims that His mighty works signify that the kingdom has already come. Justice is not done to this side of the teaching of Jesus by those who 'speak of the breaking down of the kingdom of God—the kingdom is already a reality.' The disciples of Jesus are reminded of their blessedness in that it is their privilege to see the days for which the Old Testament saints longed in vain. The context of Lk 17^{21} is held to determine the meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. Jesus is refuting the conception of the Pharisees who looked for an outward appearing to be heralded by apocalyptic signs; He reminds them, therefore, that 'the kingdom is within,' not, however, assuming that it is in *them*. The Syriac rendering of Ephraem—'in your hearts'—gives the true explanation. 'What is meant is the state of heart which characterizes the subjects of the kingdom of God.'

How is this twofold element in the teaching of Jesus concerning the kingdom to be accounted for? Some say that both aspects are presented ideally. In this sense 'the kingdom is, and it is not yet.' But Jesus was no idealist, whose thoughts oscillate between an incomplete reality and an anticipated completion. To say that Jesus accepts the diverse statements found in the Old Testament and in later Apocalyptic literature may be true; but, even so, only an external explanation is suggested. We are left in the dark as to why Jesus came to teach that the ideal had a present realization. The unity, accounting for the twofold presentation of the kingdom, is found only in the Messianic consciousness and mission of Jesus. Where *He* is making the will of God to be done on earth by virtue of His indwelling Divine powers, there is the kingdom of God. As Origen beautifully says: 'He is the kingdom itself' (αὐτοβασιλεία). Forgiveness of sins and communion with God are blessings of the kingdom experienced in the present. But during His earthly activity Jesus sees only the beginning of the realization of these blessings; His divinely appointed task is to complete the work He has begun, and that completion lies in the future.

It depends, therefore, upon the meaning assigned to 'Eschatology' whether the eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus should be described as primary or as secondary. In the form in which it appears in the Synoptic Gospels and in the early Church it is secondary, inasmuch as it is associated with contemporary ideas. But in so far as it has reference to ethical and religious perfection, which is to have an outward manifestation, eschatology is a primary and essential element in the gospel of Jesus. Feine notes that in the teaching of Jesus, lines, which do not run parallel, can be traced; also that, in the Pauline and in the Johannine writings respectively, each of those lines is drawn out at length. Hence the discussion as to whether Christianity is a religion of hope for the future or of experience in the present. 'Christianity is not rightly understood unless both are included. To the Christian salvation is a present blessing, and yet he must look to the future for its completion.'

What Feine means by saying that Jesus spoke of the kingdom of God in the language of His contemporaries appears in such passages as those which refer to positions of honour in the kingdom (Mt 20^{23}), the hundredfold reward (Mk $10^{29f.}$), and the not-eating of the Passover until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God (Lk 22^{16}). Such statements are neither to be spiritualized, nor interpreted transcendentally. Nevertheless, agreement is expressed with Wernle's words: 'The later theology which transferred blessedness to the future, *i.e.* to heaven, understood Jesus better than modern archæologists who so fix their thoughts on the present world as to forget heaven.' What Jesus means by such descriptions of the glory of the kingdom of God is a condition of blessedness to be attained now by all who enter the kingdom. The blessings of the forgiveness of sins, of purity and righteousness, of the satisfying of the soul's hunger and thirst for God, are set forth in concrete imagery in which use is made of language which would appeal to the hearers of Jesus. Abstractions are avoided, because they would have been less forcible; but there is an entire absence of the grotesque exaggerations which abound in Jewish theology, and in early Christian literature (*e.g.* Enoch 10^{17}; cf. Papias, as quoted by Irenæus, v, 33^{5}). 'The religious conceptions of undisturbed communion with God and of eternal life dominate the thought-world of Jesus.'

In brief, Feine's position is that Jesus only partially adopted the traditional conception of the kingdom of God; to a large extent He filled it with new content. Like His contemporaries, Jesus thought of the kingdom as descending from heaven

to earth. It was the kingdom of *heaven*, because it was the kingdom of the transcendent God who, on earth, was setting up the rule of heaven. Like His contemporaries, Jesus also taught that the kingdom was to be ushered in by God's power in the future. To this extent His conception was eschatological, but there was an essential difference between His idea and those of His Jewish contemporaries. Jesus eliminated all political hopes of a world-kingdom with Jerusalem as its metropolis. The eudæmonistic expectations of an age of extraordinary fruitfulness and of earthly enjoyment had for Him no value. Now and then He makes use of current forms of expression; but His own view is purely religious and ethical. Moreover, this eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus is accompanied by, and interwoven with, an ethical element. The kingdom of God is not only to be anticipated as coming in the future; it is also already established. When men are drawn to Jesus and learn from Him to do on earth the heavenly Father's will, the kingdom is extended. In the person of Jesus the eschatological and the ethical ideas of the kingdom are seen to be not antagonistic, but complementary. To Him belongs the throne of the future Kingdom, but in Him and in His work the powers of the Kingdom are already manifesting their might; hence His parables regard the Kingdom as already spreading in this world.

To the practical consequences of the theory which eschatologically conditions 'the Ethics of Jesus,' Feine returns in a later chapter. In the former part of this section he supplies a necessary corrective to Schweitzer's work which pays little attention to the modifications which Johannes Weiss introduced into the second edition of his book, *The Preaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God*. To the statements in his first edition (1892) exception was taken on the ground that his interpretation led to 'an altogether too negative and world-despising ethics.' In his second edition (1900) he acknowledged that 'part of the ethical teaching of Jesus is unaffected by His eschatological ideas.' Nevertheless, it remains true that to Weiss an important part of the ethical teaching recorded in the Gospels is incomprehensible, unless it is regarded as exceptional and as suggested by thoughts of the coming crisis. Just as in time of war special laws are proclaimed applicable only for a period, so the moral injunctions of Jesus are to be understood as referring only to a state of affairs which was about to pass away; he taught 'ethics for the interim.'

Examining in detail the expositions of Johannes Weiss, Feine shows that the eschatological interpretation unduly narrows the significance of the moral teaching of Jesus. For example, the command to love one's enemies is, in the Sermon on the Mount, connected not with thoughts of an approaching crisis, but with the revelation of the Heavenly Father, whose ethical perfection is displayed in the impartial bestowal of His gifts on the evil and on the good. Not 'ethics for the interim,' but ethics for all time are inculcated by Jesus when He gives an inward application to the commandments of the law, and condemns angry passions and base desires. Feine is of opinion that the eschatological interpretation may most legitimately be applied to the demand of Jesus that His disciples should, for His sake, give up earthly possessions and family life. But even of these passages he rightly says: 'Not only does eschatology earnestly warn us not to set too high an estimate on the things of this world, but the transitory nature of all earthly good also enforces the same lesson.' These hard sayings have an abiding meaning, as Luther perceived when he wrote, 'And though they take our life, goods, honour, children, wife,' etc. The main part of the following sections of this chapter is occupied with an exposition of the ethics of Jesus from a non-eschatological point of view. Feine holds that 'this earth is God's handiwork; that every individual, every class, every nation has its place as an instrument in God's hand for the carrying out of His world-plan; and that this plan, although we may not understand it as yet, is furthering the blessedness which is the goal of the Kingdom of God.'

In the Study.

Studies in Failure.

III.

The Failure of Success and the Success of Failure.

Mk 10[31]—'Many that are first shall be last, and the last first.' The other places in the Gospels in which this saying occurs are Mt 19[30] 20[16], Lk 13[30]. The best title for it is that given by Mozley in his *University Sermons*: 'The Reversal of Human Judgment.' And Mozley's sermon is one of the greatest that ever was preached on this great theme.

Mozley interprets the words as meaning simply that the judgments which we form in this world will be reversed in another; and he uses the text as an argument for the suspense of judgment. But the words carry a larger meaning than that. Even in this life we see men first at the beginning, last at the end. We see men first in the estimation of the multitude, last in the estimation of the discerning.

i.

Failure at the outset may be success in the end. Says Mr. Harry Quilter, 'An accomplished artist said to me once, "No picture is worth anything till it has been spoiled three times"; and it is true, I think, that what makes any given picture great is gathered from the very brink of failure.'[1] 'Throngs of witnesses,' says Bishop Lightfoot, 'might be produced to illustrate this same truth—great statesmen, great orators, great generals, great philanthropists, great mechanicians, have failed at first to succeed afterwards. The great Florentine reformer Savonarola commenced his mission. His first attempt was a total failure. He kindled no enthusiasm. His audiences dwindled away. He could not obtain a hearing. So a year passed away, and another, and another. It was failure still. But an unquenchable fire was burning within him, and he knew that it was not an earthly flame. Then at length "on a sudden," we are told, "he burst out; appalling, entrancing, shaking the souls of men, piercing to their heart of hearts, and drawing them in awestruck crowds before the foot of his pulpit." No preacher since the Apostolic days produced such striking effects as he produced.'

[1] W. L. Watkinson, *Studies in Christian Character*, i. 18.

The great English engineer George Stephenson furnishes a signal illustration of this lesson. He commenced life with the most serious disadvantages of education. He found all scientific men against him. He was confronted with the giant mass of popular *inertia* and distrust. But he was conscious of a great idea; he clung to it; and he persevered dauntlessly. 'I have fought for the locomotive single-handed,' he said, 'for nearly twenty years, having no engineer to help me. I put up with every rebuff, determined not to be put down.' At length the locomotive did triumph. And look at the consequences. Railways have revolutionized the conditions of society, not in England only, but throughout the world.[2]

But all such examples pale into nothing before the lesson of the life of Christ. History itself has reversed the judgment passed on Christ. It will reverse many of the judgments we are now forming on our fellow-men.

Speak, History! who *are* life's victors?
Unroll the long annals, and say—
Are they those whom the world *called* the victors—
Who won the success of a day?
The Martyrs or Nero? The Spartans
Who fell at Thermopylæ's tryst,
Or the Persians and Xerxes? His
Judges or Socrates? Pilate or Christ?

An old Greek philosopher—the wisest of his race—nearly four centuries before Christ, drew from his imagination a picture of the ideal righteous man. It was an essential feature in the portrait that he should be tested by the extreme of adversity, that he should be misrepresented and misunderstood; that, though righteous, he should be considered unrighteous; that he should meet with obloquy and persecution and shame; last of all—a strange, instinctive prophecy—he was to die on the gibbet. This old philosopher rightly divined. It was essential that the ideal man should fail, utterly fail, in life. Christ's perfection could only be manifested by entire failure. This failure is the most brilliant jewel in His heavenly crown; the richest portion of the inheritance which He has bequeathed to us.[3]

1. Such early failure may be a test of strength. Some men can carry on their work when paid with popular applause. They may even defy the larger circle without, if they have the approval of friends or party. But when friends look grave, when a gulf opens between principles and party, when the world misrepresents his motives and thwarts his endeavours, it is then that the strain on a man's

[2] J. B. Lightfoot, *Sermons in St. Paul's Cathedral*, p. 132.
[3] J. B. Lightfoot, *ibid.* p. 130.

courage begins. But it is just then that a man should find his support in the pattern, the spirit, the life of Christ.

The Young Pretender, leader in the Scottish rebellion of 1745, kicked against defeat instead of quietly asking how he might turn it into victory. Says Mr. Froude, 'He was a man who carried failure written in his very demeanour.' 'When he doth hear anything contrarious to his pleasures,' Lord Surrey said, 'his manner is to take his bonnet off his head and throw it in the fire. My Lord Dacre doth affirm that at his being last in Scotland he did burn above a dozen bonnets in that manner.' This was not a temper to cope successfully with the ablest of living generals. 'If he be such a man,' Surrey wisely judged, 'with God's grace, we shall speed the better with him.'[1]

2. Early failure may be also a test of faith. A man believes in himself as long as others believe in him. But when he finds himself on one side and the world on the other, he asks himself whether he alone can be right. He begins by questioning whether the voice he hears is indeed God's voice; and he ends by stifling the witness of the Spirit within him.

But the danger is not so much that we shall turn atheists or unbelievers, as that we shall be disheartened; not that we shall lose all faith, but that we shall find our faith weakened; not that we shall stake our life on winning something, at least, here in this world, but that we shall stake the keenness, the earnestness, the perseverance of our service. A man is kind to his poorer neighbours, and then waxes weary of being kind, because he does not find them so grateful as he expected. A man is diligent in his duty, and then relaxes his diligence, because another, with only half the exertion, runs past him. A tradesman is scrupulously honest, and then finds that others, who are not so strict, seem, as it were, to take the bread out of his mouth, while he gets no credit for his scrupulous honesty, and so he lets himself slip into little unfairnesses. A man in society is thoroughly unselfish, and finds that the only result is that he is unceremoniously thrust aside; or he is humble, and finds a vain man preferred to himself. In all such cases there is, of course, some danger that we should simply give up trying to do right; that we should say to ourselves, 'I have tried it, and it does not answer, and I mean to try it no more.' But that is not the only danger, nor the commonest danger, nor, I think, the greatest danger. The great danger is that we should relax the warmth and heartiness of our service, as if somehow we were pained at not being better appreciated.[2]

3. Emerson in his essay on 'Success'[3] names three things as essential to success—

1. *Aptitude.* He gives many examples. Napoleon is one example. 'There is nothing in war,' said Napoleon, 'which I cannot do by my own hands. If there is nobody to make gunpowder, I can manufacture it. The gun-carriages I know how to construct. If it is necessary to make cannons at the forge, I can make them. The details of working them in battle, if it is necessary to teach, I shall teach them. In administration, it is I alone who have arranged the finances, as you know.'

Oliver Goldsmith, one of the sweetest of English writers, was trained for medicine. He presented himself at Surgeons' Hall to be examined. His purpose was to secure the unambitious post of hospital mate. But he was rejected, and the record in the college book runs, 'James Bernard, mate to an hospital; Oliver Goldsmith, found not qualified for ditto.' In about eight years *The Vicar of Wakefield* saw the light. The original failure had been complete, and momentarily disheartening; but genius had transmuted it into a golden service to English letters.[4]

2. *Self-trust.* 'There was a wise man,' says Emerson, 'an Italian artist, Michel Angelo, who writes thus of himself: "Meanwhile the Cardinal Ippolito, in whom all my best hopes were placed, being dead, I began to understand that the promises of this world are for the most part vain phantoms, and that to confide in one's self, and become something of worth and value, is the best and safest course." Now, though I am by no means sure that the reader will assent to all my propositions, yet I think we shall agree in my first rule for success,—that we shall drop the brag and the advertisement, and take Michel Angelo's course, "to confide in one's self, and be something of worth and value."'[5]

3. *The Affirmative.* 'We must begin,' Emerson says, 'by affirming. Truth and goodness subsist for evermore. It is true there is evil and good, night and day; but these are not equal. The day is great and final. The night is for the day, but the day is not for the night. . . . The affirmative of affirmatives is love. The painter Giotto, Vasari

[1] W. J. Lacey, *Masters of To-Morrow*, p. 169.

[2] F. Temple, *Rugby Sermons*, 2nd ser., p. 269.

[3] *Society and Solitude*, p. 267.

[4] W. J. Lacey, *Masters of To-Morrow*, p. 164.

[5] Emerson, *Society and Solitude*, p. 274.

tells us, renewed art because he put more goodness into his heads.'

4. But in estimating success and failure we must take into account the lack of opportunity. Though it is true that there are men, like Josiah Wedgwood, Lincoln, and Garfield, who make opportunity for themselves, yet for the most part men have to be judged not by what they are, but by what they are in relation to their opportunities. Canon H. D. Rawnsley has a volume of sermons on the 'Sayings of Jesus' discovered by Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus. In one of these Sayings occur the words of our text; and the lesson which Canon Rawnsley finds in this particular 'Saying' is 'judge not.' He says:

'We clergy have our ideas of right and wrong; we are scandalized, for example, by the coarseness of speech, the want of external honour for religious observance say of the crew of an "ocean-tramp" steamer. When other folk are at church and chapel, they are found "running" corn or loading coal, and their language is not the language of polite society. We judge them, but we forget that their Sunday labour, and their exposure to tempests of the ocean and to the thieves and harlots of the home or foreign port, are the price at which we decent churchgoers get our corn and wine, our comforts of food and clothes and our home luxuries—we forget, as an able writer lately put it, that if vicarious sacrifice is the highest height, the deepest heart of morals, then these men who have sacrificed the interests of their bodies and souls for the rest of us are in their unchurched paganism actually a great deal higher than we. And when we have touched hands with these men and known their childlike simplicity, their quick response to what is higher when it is offered, their splendid courage and their devotion to duty, we shall more than ever incline to revise our estimate of them, from the church or chapel standard, and we shall seek for some new definition as to who is high and who is low in the kingdom of Heaven.'[1]

ii.

Temporal failure may be eternal success. Dean Church, in his *Cathedral and University Sermons* (p. 236), has a sermon on 'Failures in Life.' His text is a quotation from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, written from a Roman prison—'For I have no man like minded who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's' (Ph $2^{20.21}$). St. Paul's life at this time, he says, must have seemed like what we call a failure. And later, when the old man was led out along the Ostian Way to die, it must have appeared to friend and foe alike that his career had ended in disaster. Not so to St. Paul himself. 'What to him was the wise world's sentence on his course, or the contrast between its earlier successes and its later baffling disappointments? What was it to him, who knew in whom he had believed—to whom it was a small matter to be judged by man's judgment, yea, who judged not his own self—who knew that everything that happened to him was but a passing incident in an eternal progress, which stretched far beyond the grave, and of which the end was certain'? Then Church says: 'Failure, when it meets us, is bitter and hard to bear, to us who are so ambitious and so weak, so sanguine and so shortsighted. But what is it, but the inevitable incident of that mingled greatness and littleness of human life, of which, if we will only attend, every passing hour reminds us? "Heaven is for those who have failed on earth," says the mocking proverb; and since the day of Calvary no Christian need be ashamed to accept it.'

The word *Finis* is not yet written in the book of human history. Our horizon cannot be bounded by the senses, nor our deepest instincts viewed as mere provincialisms of this planet destined to vanish when riper knowledge dawns upon us. Though we carry nothing else out of the world, we carry out ourselves. There is continuity in the thread of existence, and no suddenness about sequels. Life is intended to be a long *crescendo*, marked not only by gain in calmer and wiser thought, in the ability to solve more complex problems and to discharge more arduous tasks, but also by those growing desires that stimulate to spiritual ascension. It will take time to perfect man. Will it not take eternity?

And what is our failure here but a triumph's evidence
For the fulness of the days?[2]

1. Who are the last that shall be first? Spurgeon divides them into four classes:

1. Some that are last in pedigree. 'God will find His jewels in the dens and alleys and slums of London, and take up to His eternal throne those that were the sons of harlots and the children of the thief, that they may sing for ever of His amazing grace.'

[1] H. D. Rawnsley, *'Sayings of Jesus' and a Lost Gospel Fragment*, p. 121.

[2] W. T. Herridge, *The Coign of Vantage*, p. 34.

2. Some that are last in education. 'If you should go into our ragged schools, especially some in the very lowest neighbourhoods, or if you would hear Mr. Gregory, the missionary in St. Giles's, tell his tale of all the sin he sees, and the education that our young men of St. Giles's get, O gentlemen of St. James's, it might well make you blush. But some who were trained for the gallows and tutored for the convict settlement shall nevertheless be taught of the Lord and inducted into the fellowship of the saints.'

3. Some that are last in morals. 'Could Sodom find sinners that would match with the sinners of London? You need not, to-night, go many steps when once the sun is down before you will see under every gaslight some that are last. Blessed be God, some of them shall be first. "There goes John Bradford, if it were not for the grace of God."'

While pæans to the conquerors are plentiful enough, it is not so often that we hear an *Io Victis!*

Io Victis.

The hymn of the low and the humble, the weary, the broken in heart,
Who strove and who failed, acting bravely a silent and desperate part;
Whose youth bore no flower in its branches, whose hopes burned in ashes away,
From whose hand slipped the prize they had grasped at, who stood at the dying of day
With the work of their life all around them, unpitied, unheeded, alone,
With death swooping down on their failure, and all but their faith overthrown.[1]

2. Low success may be high failure. In the world's 'success,' the acquisition of wealth is often accepted as the greatest test of what a man is worth. '*Rem, rem, quocunque modo rem!*' is the world's motto. And yet how often a man's success in this direction means deviation from uprightness and the destruction of the whole spirit of charity; we see—alas! how often—that the acquisition of wealth lowers and degrades a soul; that wealth is gained by those cruelties which we as a society are striving to exterminate. We recognize the confirmation of the truth, so awful for some, that '*where our treasure is there will our heart be also.*' To grovel in auriferous mire—is that success or failure? Again, success *is* a power, and yet how rarely can the ambitious man be unselfish? Generally, his ambition is not to promote the good of others but rather to attain his own ends at their expense; seldom can such as he be honest! As a rule, does he not rather sacrifice principle, character, convictions, truthfulness, even what the world deems honour; and shall such ambition, hereafter, when brought before the Judge of quick and dead, be proclaimed success or *failure*? Once more, is pleasure success? I mean that pleasure which intoxicates the soul, which prevents all serious recollection, which makes light of sin, which arrests obedience to Christ, which gratifies our love of ease, and our self-indulgence? I mean even the pleasure which leaves us, perhaps, not far from the kingdom of God, but nevertheless leaves us only there: is that success?[2]

3. And low failure may be high success. Twenty years ago a discouraged young doctor in one of our large cities was visited by his old father, who came up from a rural district to look after his boy.

'Well, son,' he said, 'how are you getting along?'

'I am not getting along at all,' was the disheartened answer. 'I'm not doing a thing.'

The old man's countenance fell, but he spoke of courage and patience and perseverance. Later in the day he went with his son to the 'Free Dispensary,' where the young doctor had an unsalaried position, and where he spent an hour or more every day.

The father sat by, a silent but intensely interested spectator, while twenty-five poor unfortunates received help. The doctor forgot his visitor while he bent his skilled energies to this task; but hardly had the door closed on the last patient when the old man burst out—

'I thought you told me you were not doing anything,' he thundered. 'Not doing anything! Why, if I had helped twenty-five people in a month as much as you have done in one morning, I would thank God that my life counted for something.'

'There isn't any money in it, though,' explained the son, somewhat abashed at his father's vehemence.

'Money!' the old man shouted, still scornfully. 'Money! What is money in comparison with being of use to your fellow-men? Never mind about money; you go right along at this work

[1] See W. T. Herridge, *The Coign of Vantage*, p. 33.

[2] H. Montagu Villiers in *Sermons on Social Subjects*, p. 138.

every day. I'll go back to the farm and gladly earn money enough to support you as long as I live—yes, and sleep sound every night with the thought that I have helped you to help your fellow-men.'[1]

4. Are there any tests of final success? There are at least these two:

1. *Dissatisfaction* with present attainment. 'It is strange to say, but it is a truth which our own observation and experience will confirm, that when a man discerns in himself most sin and humbles himself most, when his comeliness seems to him to vanish away and all his graces to wither, when he feels disgust at himself and revolts at the thought of himself,—seems to himself all dust and ashes, all foulness and odiousness, then it is that he is really rising in the kingdom of God: as it is said of Daniel, "From the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words" (Dn 10^{12}).'[2]

In one of Landor's *Imaginary Conversations*, Newton says to Barrow, 'I am not quite satisfied.' To which Barrow answers, 'Those who are quite satisfied sit still and do nothing; those who are not quite satisfied are the sole benefactors of the world.'[3]

Lord Kelvin's estimate of his work irresistibly reminds us of Sir Isaac Newton's. 'One word,' he tells us, 'characterizes the most strenuous of the efforts for the advancement of science I have made perseveringly during fifty-five years; that word is "failure." I know no more of electric and magnetic force, or of the relation between ether, electricity, and ponderable matter, than I knew and tried to teach to my students of natural philoscphy fifty years ago in my first session as professor.'[4]

[1] *Sermons by Unitarian Ministers*, p. 68.
[2] J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vi. p. 324.
[3] W. T. Herridge, *The Coign of Vantage*, p. 25.
[4] S. P. Thompson, *Life of Lord Kelvin*, 1910.

2. *Aspiration.* 'There is a heavenly contest,' says Jowett, 'of which God only and the angels are spectators. It begins here but does not end here; and it includes in itself all other careers of men. The prize which it offers is not exactly greatness or honour, but something of another kind which we can only conceive in part. The ideal which it holds out to us is moral rather than intellectual, the freedom from pride and prejudice and self, the absolute simplicity of truth, the resignation to the order of the world and to the divine will; and not resignation only, but active co-operation with them, according to our means and strength, in bringing good out of evil, truth out of falsehood. He whose mind is absorbed in these thoughts has already found life eternal. He may be a cripple, or blind, or deaf; "his home may be a straw-built shed"; but he has learnt to see and hear with another sense, and is already living in a house not made with hands or of man's building. And this perfect harmony with the divine will is the best image or likeness which we can form of that other kingdom of God in which we hope one day to be partakers.'[5]

Then, welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!
Be our joys three-parts pain!
Strive, and hold cheap the strain;
Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe!

For thence—a paradox
Which comforts while it mocks—
Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail:
What I aspired to be,
And was not, comforts me:
A brute I might have been, but would not sink i' the scale.[6]

[5] B. Jowett, *College Sermons*, p. 261.
[6] Browning, *Rabbi Ben Ezra.*

The Traditions of the Masai.

By Fritz Hommel, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Munich.

II.

To come now to the *traditions*: we must, first of all, lay emphasis on the fact that, however far back we go into the primitive times of any Semitic race by means of linguistic comparisons, investigation of names, and literary remains, we can always discover an accumulation of myths, which are very similar to the Bible stories (fight of the dragons at the creation of the world, the tree of Paradise and the serpent, original ancestors, flood), and, further, as their religion a moon-cult (star-cult) which might almost be described as henotheism. But we come across the same thing in a more primitive way among our cattle-nomads, the Masai, and here we must draw attention to the fact that among the oldest Semites, whom we must regard as cultivators rather than nomads, the ox, as their mythology clearly shows, must have played an important part —not small cattle, or the camel and the ass, not to mention the horse, which first became known to the Semites of Elam about 2000 B.C.

Moreover, among the Masai we come upon a series of distinctly ancient characteristics, which bring us near to the East Arabian home of the whole of the Western Semites, and which we do not encounter anywhere else very clearly except in the religion of the ancient Chaldæans (transformed later in the more polytheistically stamped religion of the Babylonians). To these belong, in the first place, the struggle of God with the dragon *Nenaunir* on the morning of the creation. Merker compares the Bab. *tiâmat* (later common pronunciation probably *tiamas*) with the word for 'dragon,' *en-diamassi* (fem.); and this is certainly not merely an accidental resemblance, since the word for 'Paradise,' *kerio*, goes back to the Bab. *kirû*, 'garden,' which in the time of Ḫammurabi must have been sounded uncontracted *kiriu* (cf. similarly Nabû-Nebo, at that time *Nabiu*, and many other examples).[1] Now, in ancient Chaldæan astrology this original dragon is the female lion-headed dragon with the long neck (located in the later sign of Cancer) which appears on the seal-cylinders as a lion's or dragon's head set on a stake (her consort is the so-called vulture-dragon, the Kingu of the Bab. Creation Epic); but, according to Hollis (p. 265), *nenaunir* is called 'she of the stake,' and she was originally a lion (or half-lion, half-man, with which should be compared the Chaldæan antitype of the Twins, the Janus-headed centaur, or Sagittarius, which has a lion's and a human head). To this series of characteristics belongs also the name of the morning-star, *kilegen*, which is just the Bab. *girgilu*, 'hen'; cf. the name of Venus, *Nin-dar-anna*, 'mistress of the hen of the sky' (also masculine, corresponding to the nature of the morning-star, in contrast with that of the evening-star), *Nin-dar-a*, in Gudea, which appears in ancient Sumerian hymns as *Gašan-Gir-gi-lu* (*Cun. Texts*, xv. 23; cf. Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 138, line 126 ff.). The sacred number of Ištar (S. Arab. masc. Astar), 15, plays a part at Masai births; among the el-Gargures (cf. the Abyss. Guragues?) race, who at one time were neighbours of the Masai, the mother, after the birth of a boy, had to remain in the hut for thirty days, and, after that of a girl, only fifteen (30 is the moon-number; cf. Bab. Sin 30, his daughter Ištar 15); cf. Merker, p. 293, where the 15 gourd-bottles with which the young man seeks the girl in marriage at her father's house should be noticed. If the three-headed serpent of Paradise was called *ol-arassumet* because it lived in the bushes (*ol-rossua*), it is tempting to think here also of a peculiarly Bab. word, namely, *rušumtu*, 'mud,' 'marsh' (the rush really grows near the latter).

As regards the character of the Masai legends, it is absolutely primitive, and in all its resemblances to Biblical stories it is an entirely independent flow from the same source. This is shown especially by the fact that almost entirely different names appear: thus Maitumbe corresponds to Adam (perhaps from a second form of Adam, *ma'dûmu* or *maidûmu*?); Tumbainot to Noah; Oschomó,

[1] If *en-diamassi* in Masai also means 'fetus' or 'embryo,' here also the Arabic offers a striking analogy; cf. Arab. *el-gânn* (from *el-gânin*), 'demon,' but *el-ganîn*, 'embryo.' In ancient times demons were actually thought of as dragons and similar monsters.

Bartímaro, and Barmáo to his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth; Narabá, or its doublet Metene, to Moses (cf. Metene and Rise = Moses and Aaron); Mutari to Isaac; etc. But what has not yet been observed is the precisely similar fondness for popular etymologies which are given for every one of the Masai names in these legends. If we compare the Hebrew explanations of the names Eve (Gn 3^{20}), Cain (4^{1}), Seth (4^{25}), Noah (5^{29}), Abraham (17^{5}), Isaac (21^{6}), Jacob (25^{26}), Reuben (29^{32}), etc., down to Moses (Ex 2^{50}) and Samuel (1 S 1^{20}), with the meanings of names in the Masai myths, we find that these also are often very far-fetched. For instance, Naiterogob (= Eve) called her second son *Nabe* because he had moved violently in her womb (*ebe*); Nairascho bore a son, and called him *Serea* because the ox which was killed by his father after the birth was spotted (*sera*). Must we not in astonishment exclaim with Adam, at this all-pervading fondness for interpreting, in some way or other, all the ancient names that were handed down: 'This is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh' (*i.e.* parallel organic higher development of a common tendency of ancient races, therefore similar disposition)? This is completely denied by sceptics, who object that missionaries (it is all the same whether of early times, *e.g.* the first Christian century or later) communicated these stories in the Biblical setting (and along with those Biblical etymologies) to the Masai, who afterwards re-modelled them according to their understanding and mental life, and therefore completely assimilated them to their own national sentiment, so much so, indeed, that they even freely imitated the interpretation of names. But this would be almost a greater wonder than the simple view advocated by Merker, that the Masai brought all these traditions with them from their ancient Arabian home, and that they (these old traditions) run parallel with the Hebrew ones, and that at the base of both there lies a former Chaldæan or East Arabian original which is lost to us.[1] This state of affairs is, and will certainly remain, wonderful enough; but the imageless monotheism of the savage Masai, which is disputed by nobody, is also a wonder, and is unprecedented among the races of Africa.

I now come to the traditions themselves, which Merker, in the second paragraph of his sensational fourth section, has already compared bit by bit with the corresponding features of the Biblical tradition. It must now be remarked that Merker, who, as he told me himself, had not paid any attention to the ancient stories in Genesis since his childhood, did not notice all the similarities, but overlooked some of the most important. Sellin, who himself in 1905 wrote a pamphlet on 'Die biblische Urgeschichten' (in the *Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen*, ed. by Boehmer and Kropatschek, Lichterfelde, pub. by Edw. Runge, 1 Serie, Heft 11), drew attention, in his discussion of Merker's book in *Die Reformation*, 1905, Jahrg. iv. pp. 418–421, to the parallel between the lame Schagarda and Jacob (Gn 32^{26}). But it is a still more important fact that the Masai, exactly like the Hebrews in Gn 4, count, from the creation of the world to the Deluge, *seven ancestors*, the seventh of whom had three sons, whose correspondence with the Biblical ones the following table will make clear:

Maitumbe,	Adam.	Lemajan,	Mahujaël.
Sindillo,	Abel.[2]	Learin,	Methuselah.
Serea,[3]	Enoch.	Lengeni,[5]	Lamech.
Schagarda,[4]	'Irad.		

[1] As regards the above-quoted examples (with reference to chapter and verse only), we shall now give at least one example for those who have not an Old Testament at hand. In Gn 25^{25} we read: 'And the first [of the twins] came forth red [*admôni*, a play upon the word *Edom*], and [rough] all over like a hairy garment [*se'ar*], and they called his name [therefore] Esau ['*esau*, in which the similarity of sound between *se'* in *se'ar* and '*es* in '*esau* was enough for the formation]; and after that came forth his brother, and his hand had hold on Esau's heel ['*aḳeb*]; and his name was [therefore] called *Ja'ḳob*.' But, as a matter of fact, Jacob goes back to a fuller form, Jacob-el (in which God is the subject, therefore meaning perhaps, 'God follows at the heels,' *i.e.* He rewards or punishes.

[2] Instead of Cain. As the first murder is placed by the Masai a short time before the Flood (to give it a motive as a judgment), the story of Abel and Cain is omitted here. And it really occurs a second time in Genesis (at the end of chap. 4) by way of an allusion (cf. Jabel = Abel, Jubal = Cain, and Tubal = Naemah, as the original text probably read); but it must be observed that Sindillo has a brother Sisia, from whom the smiths are descended (Cain really means 'smith').

[3] He builds the first *kraal*, as (Gn 4) Cain builds the first town for Enoch, which is called Enoch after Enoch's name.

[4] Also Ol-Ogarde, in which the similarity in sound to 'Irad (LXX Γαιδαδ for Γαιραδ) should be noticed.

[5] *I.e.* assuming Lamkan instead of Lamech (cf. Gn 5, Kainan, instead of Gn 4, Kain). Without saying a word, I have put Lengeni instead of his brother Tumbainot (= Noah; cf. *dombo*, 'ark,' Heb. *tebah*), which is quite permissible, as Tumbainot had three sons by Naipande—Oschomó, Bartí-

There is another agreement which has not been observed before, namely, the four plagues after the Deluge (Merker, p. 286 f.): (1) illness (after the first theft), (2) dung-beetles (after the unintentional killing of a sucking she-ass), (3) locusts (after the murder of a cow) followed by famine, and (4) pest (or the *urgeg*-epidemic); cf. also the augmented list of the ten plagues in Ex 7 ff., in which the four plagues of the Masai just mentioned are all represented, and—a fact to which my former pupil, Dr. Otto Weber, called my attention—for the quaternary number the four plagues in the Bab. description of the Deluge (par. 187 ff.), lions, jackals, hunger, and pest.

As regards the giving of the Ten Commandments from the Mount of God, it is characteristic of the Masai tradition that there is not a figure corresponding to Moses, who announces the sacred laws, but an angel, therefore the *mal'ak Jahweh* of the Old Testament, in the shape of a man (cf. Dn 7^{13} and Adapad, *i.e.* Marduk of Eridu, in the Bab. myth) with two wings and only one leg,[1] so that he could not move along except in leaps by means of a stick; he was called *ol-Dirima* (from *diriman*, 'crutch')—a name which is preserved in Arab. *darrâm* ('walking with a limping gait'). Among the neighbouring race of the *el-Marimar* (cf. the Nuban race *Wa'wa'* of the Egyptian inscriptions—which by phonetic laws has arisen from *Warwar*, and is preserved in the modern name *Berber* north of Khartum) God is called *Sita* (cf. the Biblical Seth in Gn 5 and also note [5] on p. 463, *ad fin.*), who is said to have been worshipped in the form of a human figure with only one leg, and therefore probably corresponds to this *ol-Dirima*.

I do not think that this Masai story of the giving of the Law necessarily presupposes the knowledge of the announcement by Moses of the Ten Commandments, of which the so-called Book of the Covenant is certainly the completion,[2] but that it was a traditional characteristic of ancient tradition long before the time of Moses that, when commandments were given by God, they were always given in the number 10, the sacred number of the Divine 'messenger' and scribe of God, Nebo;[3] besides, most of the Mosaic commandments were there before Moses, and it was the mission of this man of God, who certainly belongs to history, merely to announce them to his fellow-countrymen in a new arrangement and augmented by the Book of the Covenant.

This brings me to the last point, namely, the attempt which Merker makes in the third paragraph of his fourth section to equate the Masai patriarch ol-Eberet with the Hebrews, and—what to me seemed fatal from the beginning—the old Masai stock, the Ameroi, with the Biblical (originally perhaps the Iranian-Hittite) Amorites. If we consider how common Arabic names of races and

maro, and Barmáo (= Shem, Ham, and Japheth); but by Nahaba-Logúnja (cf. with this double name the two wives of Lamech—Ada and Zillah), the widow of his adopted brother, Lengeni, he also had other three sons (who, according to the regulations of levirate marriage, must be rightly regarded as sons)—Lesita, L'olgesan, and L'os-sero (= Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal). Therefore there also circulated among the ancestors of the Masai double reports (or myth-variants) similar to the parallel lists of forefathers among the Hebrews (Gn 4, 5). Evidently, to obtain the sacred number 7, Gn 4 chose Noah, and the Masai narrator chose Lengeni (put by me above instead of Tumbainot) = Lamech; the number 10 in Gn 5 (cf. Berosus on this point) was got by assuming God (read Edom instead of Adam) and the Divine-human mediator (Seth = λόγος = Adapad; cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiv. 103–109).

[1] The description of the angel as a one-legged being may be simply the naïve expression for 'lame in the hip' or 'limping,' which at once tempts one to think of the lame fire-god of the Greeks (the Chaldæan Nebo, as Nusku-Gibil, is also a fire-god) and of Ex 37^{26} (where, according to the right interpretation, it was not Jacob's hip that was put out of joint, but rather the angel's who wrestled with him, in spite of 37^{32}). And the hip-lame Schagarda = Irad ('*I-jrad* means 'the fire descended'; cf. Bab. *Arad-Gibil*) corresponds to Nebo-Nusku (see my pamphlet, *Die altoriental. Denkmäler und das alte Testament*,[2] Berlin, 1903, p. 30). The Egyptian description of Ptah and Osiris goes back to a similar idea; cf. the illustration in Budge, *Gods of the Egyptians*, vol. ii., between p. 130 and p. 131, in which Osiris, in the quaint mummy-like disguise, really appears to have only one leg, and carries a long sceptre, like a stick, in his hand. It should also be noticed that the eldest son of the god of heaven, *ol-Gurugur*, who appears as the mediator between God and man (Merker, *Masai*,[2] p. 206), recalls in a striking way the old Sumerian name of Marduk of Eridu, *Gurru-gulla* (*-dug*), in a later development *Shilig* (from *gurug*) *-gulla-dug*; but this may be an accidental resemblance, as thunder is called *ki-kurukur* in Masai, and Gurugur appears in thunder and lightning.

[2] With the end of the Book of the Covenant (Ex 23^{19} = 34^{26}, 'Thou shalt not seethe the kid in its mother's milk') cf. the similar horror of eating flesh along with milk among the Masai (Merker, pp. 33 and 232).

[3] Cf. Sin (the moon) 30, and his daughter Ištar (Venus) 15. Šamaš (the sun) 20 and his son Nusku 10 stood in a similar relation, but Nusku is only a doublet of Nebo, which, therefore, is entirely wanting in the Bab. list of Divine numbers (K. 170).

persons like el-ʿÂmir, ʿAmâra, ʿImrân (from Amirân) are, there is not the slightest reason for connecting the Ameroi with the Amorites, who played a part in Palestine only, and came from the north. It is far more probable that ol-Eberet, in case the Arabic al-Abrahat (Abyss. Abraha, which, it is true, is usually supposed to be the same as the Heb. Abraham), or another Arabic name with a similar sound, is not to be compared, is identical with ʿEber, the mythical ancestor of the Hebrews, while ol-Eberet's son Geréua bears a striking resemblance to Eber's grandson *Reʿû* (LXX Ρεγου, shortened from Reʿû-el, Reguel) (Gn 11^{18}); but, as the district of ʿEber-Peleg coincides with the Arabian district Jemâma, this points directly back again to East Arabia, the original home of all the Western Semites.[1]

While the Masai traditions, as they at last became accessible to Merker after long effort, are always carefully guarded by a few older people, there are also among the myths generally current among the Masai, as they became known to Hollis in British East Africa, some which must be regarded as distinct echoes of the sacred myths. Among them I include what Hollis (p. 270) relates of the god Naiteru-kop (but the word has the fem. art., therefore the female beginner of the world, the first female of the country), in which, therefore, the Eve of the Masai has become a deity, while the opposite would be much more incomprehensible; the sending down of the cattle from heaven (Hollis, p. 270; cf. Merker, p. 272), and the story of Le-eyo's disobedience (Hollis, p. 271), in which I detect a faint echo of Merker's description of the Fall, which coincides so strikingly with the Bible. When we consider how widespread was the association of the tree of Paradise with the snake in the ancient East (down to the time of the Greeks), the preservation of this feature among the Masai along with the rest is not so very wonderful.[2]

I close this article with the sure expectation that now, when my deceased friend's book has appeared in a second edition, the traditions of the Masai will no longer meet with the scepticism to which they were exposed when they were first divulged, but that they will be duly appreciated in their incalculable importance for the history of religion, as they deserve to be. And I repeat once more, that a Christian or Jewish influence of a former time (at all events through Christian Nuba from the third century A.D., or through the Jewish Falashas on the borders of Abyssinia), or from the older northern abodes of the Masai, is out of the question, because then—a fact which Merker had emphasized—one would necessarily have expected connexions not only with the history of the Biblical ancestors and patriarchs down to the giving of the Law, but also with the later parts of Biblical history (and especially some sort of allusion to the Gospels, in the event of Christian missionaries coming into consideration). The above-mentioned connexions with the Chaldæan traditions, and these even in points where the Bible does not show such a connexion,[3] entirely do away with all doubt.

[1] Cf. also my *Grundriss* (Munich, 1904), p. 184, A. 1.

[2] I might, in passing, also draw attention to the fact that the name of the old medicine-man *Lesigiriëschi* (Merker, p. 289) is certainly to be compared with *i-Sigiriaischi*—the name given to the Somali by the Masai.

[3] To these probably belongs the remarkable resemblance between the name of the primitive dragon (*diamassi* = *tiâmat*) Nenaunir, and *Ki-Nunir*, 'place of combat,' an originally mythical locality in the ancient Bab. district of the Eastern Tigris (Kvirinta of the Zendavesta, where the three-headed dragon Dahâka-Zohak was defeated; cf. also the three-headed snake of Paradise of the Masai) near Sirgulla; cf. also the pole form of the tree *e'naunir* (Merker, p. 280, and the above-mentioned (p. 462) Masai etymology of Nenaunir, with which may then be compared the Bab. *giš-ku-nir* (from *giš-ku nu-nir*), a weapon of the god Nebo, probably to be imagined in the shape of a dragon (cf. my *Grundriss*, p. 379, note 6).

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

Revelation xxii. 14.

'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.'—R.V.

The first Beatitude that Jesus Christ spoke from the Mountain was, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' The last Beatitude that He speaks from heaven is, 'Blessed are they that wash their robes.' And the act commended in the last is but the outcome of the spirit extolled in the first. For they who are poor in spirit are such as know themselves to be sinful men; and those who know themselves to be sinful men are they who will cleanse their robes in the blood of Jesus Christ.

I always regard this as a test text. I should like to ask every Sunday-school teacher, every district visitor, every worker in an inquiry room, to take it, just as it stands, and expound it. And if he stumbles over it, or muddles it, I should like to send him back for a while to a form in God's school, there to learn Christ from Christ Himself, before he ventures to teach others. I said 'learn *Christ*'; not theologies, not systems of doctrine, but Christ. Christ is here in every word, Christ Jesus, God's Anointed Saviour of poor sinners; 'all and in all' to souls. If a man cannot preach Christ from this passage, He does not know the Gospel so as to be a fit teacher either of babes, or of strong men. It is not a difficult passage, if a man has first the root of the matter in him, and then has sat, as a little child, at the feet of the Holy Ghost to be taught, as He alone can teach, God's beautiful equipoise of truth.[1]

The text tells us (1) who are the Blessed of the last Beatitude, and (2) what are their privileges. The Blessed are 'they that do his commandments,' or, as in the Revised Version, according to another reading, 'they that wash their robes.' Their privileges are right of access to the Tree of Life and entrance through the gates into the City.

I. The Blessed.
II. Their Privileges.
  1. Entrance into the City.
  2. Access to the Tree of Life.

I.

The Blessed.

We are face to face at once with a difficulty of reading. The A.V. has 'Blessed are they that do his commandments,' following one reading; the R.V. 'Blessed are they that wash their robes,' following another. The difference, which seems so great in English, is due to the exchange of only a few letters in Greek. But the change from the Authorized Version to the Revised is generally hailed by expositors as a relief. 'Blessed are they that do his commandments,' says Maclaren,[2] 'carries us back to the old law, and has no more hopeful a sound in it than the thunders of Sinai. If it were, indeed, amongst Christ's last words to us, it would be a most sad instance of His 'building again the things he had destroyed.' It is relegating us to the dreary old round of trying to earn heaven by doing good deeds; and I might almost say it is 'making the Cross of Christ of none effect.' The fact that that corrupt reading came so soon into the Church and has held its ground so long, is to me a very singular proof of the difficulty which men have always had in keeping themselves up to the level of the grand central Gospel-truth: 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by his mercy, he saved us.'

Dean Vaughan speaks even more strongly against the reading. If this is the saying of Christ, he says, we must bow to it. If it pleased Him to leave as His last word to the Churches this condemning sentence, it is not for us to remonstrate or to rebel. If it was the will of Christ to re-place His Church, by the very latest of His revelations, on a footing of meritorious obedience, it must be so, and, though with downcast looks and tottering steps, we must set ourselves to follow. Yet we cannot check the rising thought, 'We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed man.'

But is there this difference between the readings? There is, and more than this difference, if they who 'do his commandments' have not yet 'washed their robes'; or if, to put it from the other side, the washing of the robes were not one of the commandments that had to be done, and indeed the sum and substance of them. It is quite true that our right of access to the Tree of Life is

[1] A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, ii. 105.

[2] *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. 43.

not of works, but of grace; yet when we have been saved by grace we proceed to keep the commandments of God. This is the evidence of our salvation, and the enjoyment of it. 'If a man love me, he will keep my words'—that is doing His commandments—'and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (Jn 14^{23})—that is enjoying access to the Tree of Life.

Swete has some difficulty in deciding between the readings. If the Greek letters were changed in the course of transcription, he thinks it slightly more probable that 'wash their robes' arose out of 'do his commandments' than that the reverse occurred. But the evidence of the documents is in favour of 'wash their robes'; and in the Johannine Writings the phrase is '*keep* his commandments,' '*do*' occurring only once, in 1 Jn 5^{2}. On the whole, then, he thinks, 'wash their robes' may with some confidence be preferred.

1. I need not remind you, I suppose, says Maclaren,[1] how continually this symbol of the robe is used in Scripture as an expression for moral character. This Book of the Apocalypse is saturated through and through with Jewish implications and allusions, and there can be no doubt whatever that in this metaphor of the cleansing of the robes there is an allusion to that vision which the Apocalyptic seer of the Old Covenant, the prophet Zechariah, had when he saw the High Priest standing before the altar clad in foul raiment, and the word came forth, 'Take away the filthy garments from him.' Nor need I do more than remind you how the same metaphor is often on the lips of our Lord Himself, notably in the story of the man that had not on the wedding garment, and in the touching and beautiful incident in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, where the exuberance of the father's love bids them cast the best robe round the rags and the leanness of his long-lost boy. Nor need I remind you how Paul catches up the metaphor, and is continually referring to an investing and a divesting—the putting on and the putting off of the new and the old man. In this same Book of the Apocalypse, we see, gleaming all through it, the white robes of the purified soul: 'They shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.' 'I beheld a great multitude whom no man could number, who had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'

All three made their way to the beautiful valley of Ivirna, where the lands of the chief Manaune were situated. The welkin rang with merry shouts of *Kua tau mai Rori!* ('Rori is found!') The news spread all over the island the same day, so that crowds came to see this poor fellow. And a miserable skeleton he was, his skin almost black through continual exposure. A feast was made for him by the people of Ivirna, but he scarcely tasted the unaccustomed food. He was then led in procession round the island by his protector and others; the crowning point was for him to bathe in Rongo's Sacred Fountain, in token of his being cleansed from a state of bondage and fear, and being allowed to participate freely in all the good things of the dominant tribe.[2]

This mysterious robe, which answers nearly to what we mean by character, is made by the wearer. That is a solemn thought. Every one of us carries about with him a mystical loom, and we are always weaving—weave, weave, weaving—this robe which we wear, every thought a thread of the warp, every action a thread of the weft. We weave it, as the spider does its web, out of its own entrails, if I might so say. We weave it, and we dye it, and we cut it, and we stitch it, and then we put it on and wear it, and it sticks to us. Like a snail that crawls about your garden patches, and makes its shell by a process of secretion from out of its own substance, so you and I are making that mysterious thing that we call character, moment by moment. It is our own self, modified by our actions. Character is the precipitate from the stream of conduct which, like the Nile Delta, gradually rises solid and firm above the parent river and confines its flow.[3]

2. The foul robes can be cleansed. Our text does not state the method. That has already been declared. 'They washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb' (7^{14}). In his Epistle St. John has the same paradox: 'The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin' (1 Jn 1^{7}). John saw the paradox, and he saw that the paradox helped to illustrate the great truth which he was trying to proclaim, that the red blood whitened the black robe, and that in its full tide there was a limpid river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the Cross of Christ.

3. But it is not a past washing only that is spoken of here. It is also a daily washing of the robes of the redeemed even now. It is not, 'Blessed are they that have washed.' The Greek is the perpetual present—'Blessed are they that keep washing.' Having once washed the whole body in the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness, they have need constantly to wash the feet, soiled afterwards, and again and again, by contact with the dust and the miry clay of this world. 'Blessed are they that evermore wash their robes,' by an ever-repeated application of the

[1] *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. 45.

[2] Gill, *From Darkness to Light in Polynesia*, p. 234.

[3] A. Maclaren, *ibid.* 46.

'blood of sprinkling' alike to the accusing conscience and to the sin-stained life.

It is a most dangerous thing to fall into the habit of letting any committed sin pass *sub silentio* (as it were) between man and his soul. Scripture indeed counsels no morbid self-scrutiny. Harm may be done by it. A man may walk timidly and slavishly before God by reason of it. We are not taught that many express words, or perhaps any express words, need pass about particular wrong thoughts, acts, or words, in direct converse on the subject between God and the soul. But if so, it must be because the intercourse is so thorough that it need not be microscopic. The man does not wash each separate spot and stain, because he washes the whole robe, and them with it. One way or another, the tablets of memory and the tablets of conscience and the tablets of life must be sponged clean every evening—and in only one way, by what Scripture calls 'the blood of the Lamb'—that is, the Atonement made once for all for all sin, applied in earnest faith to the individual man's heart and soul in the sight of God.[1]

I have been told that in this district in days gone by, those who were communicants of the Church might be known by the 'washings' on the ropes in their greens, or, if they had no greens, on the dykes and hedges near their houses on the week before the communion Sabbath. And on one communion Sabbath morning, as I had occasion to go over the dewy fields very early, I met a working man near a rock in the middle of a field well away from the town, to whom I said, when I came up to him, 'Dear me, James, you are early about.' To which he replied, 'Ay, I always come out at sunrise on the communion Sunday to prepare'; and then something told me quite plainly that he had been at prayer at the rock-side before I had appeared.[2]

4. The washing of their robes is done by the Blessed themselves. 'Blessed are they that wash their robes.' On the one hand is all the fulness of cleansing; on the other is the heap of dirty rags that will not be cleansed by you sitting there and looking at them. The two must be brought into contact. How? By the magic band that unites strength and weakness, purity and foulness, the Saviour and the penitent; the magic band of simple affiance, and trust and submission to the cleansing power of His death and of His life.

Six centuries ago there lived a youth of almost intolerable arrogance, arising from a sense of his own superiority, who, thwarted in love, thwarted in ambition, thwarted in every lofty aim for his country, beguiled by the dazzling wild beast of impurity, tempted by the gaunt wolf of avarice, torn by the lion of fierce anger, trying in vain to save himself by external conformity and by donning the girdle of a Franciscan Tertiary, eating the bitter bread of exile, and swallowing the salt tears of infinite disappointment, felt even in middle life that he had lost his way completely in the wild and savage forest, and could not reach the sunny hill of moral order and holiness. Yet he, too, taught by the grace of God to face the eternal realities, to see the things that are, and to see them as they are, see sin as it is and himself as he was, did climb strugglingly by the steep hill of penitence, and pass through the purifying flame, and became the greatest singer of the Christian Church—the mighty Dante.[3]

[1] C. J. Vaughan, *Authorized or Revised?* 303.

[2] Donald M. Henry, Whithorn.

II.

Their Privileges.

Their privileges are two: Right to come to the Tree of Life and Entrance into the City. Now the Tree of Life is in the midst of the Paradise of God, and the Paradise is in the centre of the City of God. So we come first through the gates into the City.

I. Entrance into the City. The City is the society of the Redeemed. In relation to Christ it is spoken of as a Bride. In relation to the followers of Christ themselves as a City, the City in which they dwell together.

In the old world the whole power and splendour of great kingdoms was gathered in their capitals, Babylon and Nineveh in the past, Rome in the present. To John the forces of evil were all concentrated in that city on the Seven Hills. To him the antagonistic forces which were the hope of the world were all concentrated in the real ideal city which he expected to come down from heaven—the New Jerusalem.

What are the characteristics of this city of God into which the Blessed of the last Beatitude enter?

1. *It is a City of Social Activities.* Genesis began with a garden, man's sin sent him out of the garden. God out of evil evolves good, and for the lost garden comes the better thing, the found city. 'Then comes the statelier Eden back to man.' For surely it is better that men should live in the activities of the city than in the sweetness and indolence of the garden; and manifold and miserable as are the sins and the sorrows of great cities, the opprobria of our modern so-called civilization, yet still the aggregation of great masses of men for worthy objects generates a form of character, and sets loose energies and activities, which no other kind of life could have produced.

Paradise Lost was a garden, Paradise Regained is a city. Whatever else there was in the one, of beauty, of glory, it was a self-life. All was there, if not of luxury, if not of

[3] F. W. Farrar, in the *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxvii. 66.

indolence, yet at least of enjoyment and of isolation. There were no sights or sounds of distress, to evoke the nobler feelings of pity and sympathy, or the nobler activities of helping and ministering. Even the spiritual life of Paradise, if we may not with reverence speak of it as selfish, was yet a life self-concentrated and self-contained, redeemed only from an unlovely exclusiveness, on the one side by there being none to shut out, on the other side by its being lived in the light of a God of Love. Not until sin entered, and death by sin, was there either the family to evoke charity, or the Church to exercise communion.[1]

2. *It is a City of Reunion.* Scripture leads us to associate the reunion of dead and living in a world from which all idolatry and all selfishness will have been for ever cast out by the unveiled presence of that one Person whom to know is life, whom to serve is glory. St. Paul used to speak of meeting there his own converts, Asiatic and European, and seemed to say that it would scarcely be heaven to him if they shared it not with him. 'He that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us—*with you*.' 'What is our glory or joy or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming?' So large was his conception of the amplitude of the glory, and of its characteristic features of human sympathy as well as of Divine communion.

Surely there, amidst the solemn troops and sweet societies, the long-loved, long-lost, will be found again. I cannot believe that, like the Virgin and Joseph, we shall have to go wandering up and down the streets of Jerusalem when we get there, looking for our dear ones. 'Wist ye not that I should be in the Father's house?' We shall know where to find them.

We shall clasp them again,
And with God be the rest.[2]

3. *It is a City of Abiding.* The city is the emblem of security and of permanence. No more shall life be as a desert march, with changes which only bring sorrow, and yet a dreary monotony amidst them all. We shall dwell amid abiding realities, ourselves fixed in unchanging, but ever growing completeness and peace. The tents shall be done with, we shall inhabit the solid mansions of the city which hath foundations, and shall wonderingly exclaim, as our unaccustomed eyes gaze on their indestructible strength, 'What manner of stones, and what buildings are here!'—and not one stone of these shall ever be thrown down.

[1] C. J. Vaughan, *Authorized or Revised?* 307.
[2] A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. 52.

2. **Access to the Tree.** As the City is social, the Tree of Life is individual. In the City we enjoy the society of the Redeemed; at the Tree of Life we enjoy fellowship with God, a fellowship which is the peculiar privilege of each one of those who have washed their robes. We receive a name which no one knows except the Giver and the receiver of it. The promise is particular: 'If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love *him*, and we will come unto *him*, and make our abode with *him*.'

The tree of life stands out in the first pages of God's word as a sacramental symbol to unfallen man. It was a visible and tangible thing—a tree growing in the garden like other trees, but so inscribed with the word of God that in the use of its fruit, unfallen man could receive the spiritual assurance of God's love and favour. In this respect it differed from the other trees of the garden: they were God's permitted gifts to satisfy man's animal wants; but the tree of life has regard to the higher needs of his spiritual nature, which even then had a genuine sacramental instinct, and hungered for some tangible assurance of God's abiding grace.

When Adam sinned, the way to the tree of life was no longer open to him; and this healthful sacrament became at once forbidden fruit. In very mercy its use was forbidden to him, and put beyond his reach. Evidently its withdrawal has a peculiar solemnity about it: it is to save man from a fresh blunder and a new sin. The dream—that if only, by any means, he could retain the coveted assurance of God's love, all would be well, and all his disobedience would be neutralized, and all his sin forgotten — must at once be rudely broken. Even more than that, there is a dreadful possibility of his destroying all hope of restoration, if he rush in and claim the old symbol of God's love. For him to feed on the tree of life, when in a state of sin and anger and shame, would practically mean a second death.

But when we have washed our robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, we have again as good a fitness to approach the Tree of Life as in primeval innocence. It is our fitness that constitutes our right. It is in being cleansed that the new right to come and eat is valid. Not unsullied innocence itself can come with surer step

to have the bread of God's own life given to it, than impurity that has been graciously cleansed away. The pardoned rebel, in his robes washed white, has a title to life as good as the angels, who have never defiled their garments.[1]

'I am going to a city
Where the living never die,
Where no sickness and no sorrow can molest;
From this body to release me
He is speeding from on high;
He will greet me and escort me to my rest.'

Charles M. Alexander, the singer-evangelist, once told the following story of the origin of the hymn of which the above is the chorus:—

'I always like to know how hymns came to be written, and so I asked the man who wrote this hymn how he came to do so. He told me that a friend of his went from New York City to the country. He was far gone in consumption, but in the deceptive nature of the disease thought that he was growing better day by day, till one morning he said he was so much improved in health that he was returning to the city the next day. The writer of the hymn went to see him in the afternoon, and found him in bed again. "Why," he said, "I thought you were going to the city to-morrow?" The sick man's face lighted up, and he answered, "I'm going to a city, but it is a city where the living never die, and where no sickness and no sorrow can come." After his death, his friend, remembering his words, wrote this hymn.'

1. Access to the Tree of Life is a matter of *right*, not of *reward*.

This we might illustrate by reference to the case of a pupil who is being promoted from a school of one grade to a school that is of a grade higher. He is promoted, not for the purpose of rewarding him for the faithful work he has done in the inferior grades, but because the superior grade is the place for him. He has acquired the '*right*' to a place in that grade. That pupils are sometimes promoted before they have acquired the right, and prematurely advanced out of considerations of favouritism, is undoubtedly the fact, but advancement on such grounds invalidates the whole scheme of promotion and, in all ordinary relations,—in everything, I mean, except in religion,—is amenable to universal disapproval. Whether in schools or in matters of civil service, individual merit is regarded as the essential condition of candidature; and to set up some other principle of preferment in matters of the future world, and to assume that there is some other legitimate title to the tree of life besides simple individual *right* to the tree of life, and *right* to a residence in the celestial city, is to break with what we all recognize as justice in affairs of mundane experience, and to let our future condition be decided by a so-called system of divine determination too arbitrary and evasive to be tolerated by any reputable human civil service commission. If, then, the pupil is promoted, it is not to reward him for his work; and if he is not promoted, it is not to punish him for his lack of work. There is a place where he belongs, and in any well-regulated system of school administration the place where he belongs is the place where he will be kept or put.[2]

2. But if the right is more minutely examined, it will be found to be—(1) *A right of Promise.* 'This is the promise which he promised us, even the life eternal' (1 Jn 2^{25}). The promise is made sure by the washing of the robes in the blood of the Lamb. 'For how many soever be the promises of God, in him is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen (2 Co 1^{20}).

(2) *A right of Inheritance.* 'As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God' (Jn 1^{12}). And this Johannine assurance is confirmed by St. Paul: 'Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3^{26}). 'And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ (Ro 8^{17}).

(3) *A right of Fitness.* This is the special right of the text, and it is as sure as the others, however astonishing that may be. 'Made fit for the inheritance of the saints in light'—that is one thing. That is the entrance which is abundantly ministered unto us through the gates into the city. Fitness also for fellowship so close and intimate that because He lives we live also; and that 'I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.' That is the right to the Tree of Life.

Of all the tombs in Westminster Abbey, few are more interesting than that of our bright hero, King Henry v. His youth, too, was spent in idle noise, among drunken and debauched companions, but when, in our Jerusalem Chamber by the bedside of his dying father, his heart was touched for the first time by the grace of God, when from a frivolous and dissolute youth he went forth a king, not only in power, but in character, we know how he flung off his old follies and his old sins, and said to the obscene companion of his youth:

'I know thee not, old man: fall to thy prayers;
How ill white hairs become a fool and jester!
I have long dream'd of such a kind of man,
So surfeit-swell'd, so old and so profane;
But, being awaked, I do despise my dream.
Reply not to me with a fool-born jest:
Presume not that I am the thing I was;
For God doth know, so shall the world perceive,
That I have turn'd away my former self;
So will I those that keep me company.'

If this be in part only traditional, yet when you look upon his stately tomb in the Confessor's Chapel, on the frieze that ornaments it, between the swans and antelopes of the De Bohuns you see a flaming beacon or cresset-light, which he took for his badge, 'showing thereby,' says an old

[1] R. Waterston, *Thoughts on the Lord's Supper*, 23.

[2] C. H. Parkhurst, *A Little Lower than the Angels*, 85.

chronicler, 'that although his virtues had been formerly obscured, and lay as a dead coal, waiting for light to kindle it, by reason of tender years and evil company, notwithstanding he being now come to perfecter years and to riper understanding, had shaken off his evil counsellors, and his virtues now shine forth as a light of a cresset, which is no ordinary light.' And you know how on his early deathbed he was heard again and again to cry aloud, as if defying the evil spirit of his youth: 'Thou liest! thou liest! my part is with my Lord Jesus Christ!'[1]

[1] F. W. Farrar, *ibid.* 67.

Recent Oriental Archaeology.

By A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

One of the most important works that have appeared of late years on the archæology of the ancient East is a large volume on *The Seal-Cylinders of Western Asia*, by Dr. Hayes Ward, published by the Carnegie Institution at Washington (1910). The author has made the subject peculiarly his own, and his book embodies the results of almost a lifetime's study. He has prepared the way for it by his work on the seal-cylinders in Mr. Pierpont Morgan's magnificent collection, some account of which has already been given in The Expository Times. In the present volume no less than 1315 seal-cylinders are reproduced.

For a knowledge of the mythology, religious beliefs and practices, and artistic development of early Babylonia and the countries dependent on Babylonian culture, the seal-cylinders are invaluable. But the study of them has been attended with many difficulties. It is seldom that the inscriptions which often accompany the designs throw any light upon the meaning of the latter, and the signification of the designs themselves is frequently very obscure. It is only by the use of the scientific instrument of comparison that in many cases their signification has been arrived at, and comparison needs the collection of a large number of examples before it acquires scientific value. In the course of his researches, Dr. Hayes Ward has made many discoveries, and the classes into which he has succeeded in separating the cylinders and the designs upon them, as well as the explanations he has given of them, will render his book a standard authority for many years to come.

The Syro-Hittite cylinders, of which he finds several different types, have evidently specially attracted him, and his chapters upon them are not the least valuable in his book. They open up a new and very interesting line of study, and will help to throw light on the early relations between Babylonia, the original home of the seal-cylinder, on the one side, and the Amorites of Syria and the Hittites of Asia Minor, on the other. As far back as the copper age the seal-cylinder found its way both to Cyprus and to Troy, and it had been domesticated in Egypt long before the rise of the First Dynasty. A comparison between the seal-cylinders found in these countries with those of Babylonia ought to show to what period in Babylonian history the migration of the seal-cylinder to the West must be assigned. In Cyprus and Egypt, at any rate, it was before the age of the dynasties of Ur or of Khammu-rabi, if not before the age of Sargon of Akkad; the seal-cylinders hitherto discovered in the Hittite region indicate, on the other hand, the period of Khammu-rabi.

It is a pity that Dr. Hayes Ward was unable to give photographic reproductions of the cylinders; copies made by the hand are not always trustworthy, especially where cuneiform characters are attempted to be drawn by persons who are unacquainted with them. The actual reading of certain inscriptions, for instance, on the Syro-Hittite cylinders could never be ascertained from the printed copies of them. I could wish, too, that the book had been provided with an index.

The Abbé Martin's Assyriological work is always distinguished by careful scholarship, and his latest book[1] is a valuable addition to Assyrian philology. It is occupied with the letters dated in the reigns of Nabonidos, Cyrus, Darius, and Cambyses, which have been published by the authorities of the

[1] *Lettres néo-babyloniennes*, by Fr. Martin. Paris: Champion, 1909.

British Museum in the 22nd Part of *Cuneiform Texts*. Most of the letters in this collection are, unfortunately, of little or no interest, and the Abbé has therefore been well advised to edit only a selection from them. Those which he has translated throw light on the daily life of the Babylonian people in the age of the Persian conquest, and show how like it was to that of most Oriental peoples to-day. There was the same oppression by the officials, whether religious or civil, the same unavailing complaints by the victims, and the same jealousies and defamations of character. The High Priest of Sippara, as M. Martin observes, appears in a particularly bad light: 'One of his subordinates is forced to keep the royal horses at his own expense; another, a scribe, he refuses to pay for work done; he interferes in judicial affairs, and is not afraid to extend his protection to a murderer.'

The three most important and interesting letters in the collection are two from a Babylonian officer who apparently commanded the Babylonian forces in the war against Assyria which led to the fall of Nineveh, and a third from an Assyrian king to an official in Babylonia ordering him to send to Nineveh certain tablets which were to be found in the library of the temple at Borsippa as well as in the private libraries of certain individuals there. Unfortunately, all three documents are much mutilated: even as it is, they give us a good deal of welcome information. I must not part from the Abbé Martin without mentioning that he has added a very useful glossary of words to his book.

Professor Prášek has now published the second and concluding volume of his exhaustive work on the history of the Medes and Persians.[1] It is a volume of which he may well be proud. It has been brought thoroughly up to date, and the philological allusions in it have been revised by Dr. Hoffmann-Kutschke, thus ensuring their agreement with the latest results of philological research. Everywhere there is evidence of careful investigation and sound judgment; no authority has been overlooked, and the references are quite a marvel of completeness. The student of ancient history is now in possession of all that is known up to the present of that portion of Persian history which is so important for understanding the later books of the Old Testament. Use has naturally been made of the Assuan papyri, and the admirable index at the end is worthy of the book.

[1] *Geschichte der Meder und Perser bis zur makedonischen Eroberung*, by J. V. Prášek. Gotha: Perthes, 1910.

Professor Hilprecht's latest work has an interest much beyond that of a merely Assyriological publication.[2] Among the cuneiform tablets from the library, or libraries, of the ancient Nippur which have been recently examined are some of exceptional interest. Besides lists of cuneiform signs and proper names, grammatical treatises in Sumerian and Semitic, geographical and similar lists, lists of weights and measures, months and dates, medical prescriptions, hymns, prayers and liturgies, mathematical and astronomical texts, there are also historical documents, as well as chronological tables. They have come from the site known as 'Tablet Hill,' which Professor Hilprecht believes to have been ruined at the time of the Elamite invasion of Babylonia in the age of Khammu-rabi and Rim-Sin. At all events, between this period and that of the Kassite king Burna-buryas (1400 B.C.) there is a break in the history of Nippur: no tablets are met with, and in the Kassite age which followed the restoration of the temple by Burna-buryas the library seems to have been transferred to the western side of the Shatt en-Nil.

Most of the texts from 'Tablet Hill' are written in Sumerian, but two were found last autumn by Professor Hilprecht, and pieced together from a number of fragments, which are in Semitic Babylonian. One of these is a record of a hitherto unknown king of Gutium or Kurdistan—the Goyyim of Genesis—whose name is read Erridu-pizir by the discoverer. As he calls himself king 'of the four quarters of the world,' like Sargon of Akkad, Erridu-pizir must have been a great conqueror, and have claimed universal dominion. Professor Hilprecht believes that the capture and sack of Nippur which is described in so many songs of lamentation was his doing.

The second text is still more interesting, as it is a fragment of an early version of the Deluge story. Unfortunately, the discovery of it has aroused a considerable amount of acrimonious and not alto-

[2] *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, vol. v. part 1. *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur*, by H. V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia, 1910.

gether fair controversy in America, with which we on this side of the Atlantic have no concern. Professor Hilprecht, however, laid himself open to attack by claiming for his text that it was not only an early version, but the earliest at present known. But this cannot be proved, as it is undated, and the forms of the characters are not older than the close of the Khammu-rabi period, while a fragment of a version discovered by Professor Scheil a few years ago is actually dated in the reign of the fourth successor of Khammu-rabi. Moreover, it must be remembered that the well-known version of the story discovered by George Smith goes back, like the epic in which it is embodied, to the Khammu-rabi age, though the edition of it which has come down to us belongs to the time of Assur-bani-pal.

The new text is but a fragment, and the translation of what remains, therefore, is not always very easy. I cannot follow Professor Hilprecht in reading what is left of line 12 (. . . *ku um mi ni*) as *kum mini* 'instead of a number,' though I am unable to suggest any alternative rendering. At all events, I do not know what he could be thinking of in proposing to translate the biblical *l'mînêhu* 'instead of a number'; the Hebrew words could never mean this.

But I am at one with him in holding that the Babylonian story of the Deluge, with its close approximation to the language of Genesis, was known to the Hebrews before the Mosaic age, and I cannot do better than quote some of his concluding words: 'There remains no other period to be considered when the oldest version of the Deluge story could possibly have entered Canaan than the time when Abraham, whom I regard as a truly historical person, left his home on the Euphrates and moved westward; in other words, the period of the first dynasties of Isin and Babylon, of which Khammu-rabi or Amraphel is the central figure. This is the time when the Amorites knocked at the gates of Babylonia, invaded the country, and soon overthrew the old order of things, at the same time getting themselves intimately acquainted with Babylonian literature and civilization, which they finally accepted.' Abraham was an Amorite in the Babylonian acceptation of the name, and, as one of the upper classes, would have been educated in the learning of the Babylonians.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Aberdeen.

Part IV.

On the theory above stated about Luke's two authorities, we assume that there was some considerable difference between them in word, but not in fact. The contemporary authority (lost, except as Luke preserves it) mentioned words that were not taken into the Church Rite, and there is a noteworthy difference between Mark and Luke as to the words spoken after the Cup, about which I do not venture to make any suggestion. But with regard to the general fact of difference between the two authorities, it is sufficient to prove their absolute independence of one another, but not sufficient to show any inconsistency or contradiction. Rather, it amounts simply to the degree of difference that will always be found between two witnesses reporting without mutual consultation part of the words and acts of a rather complicated incident. According to our view, the difference would probably have been greater, had it not been for the influence of the Church Rite, which preserved the memory of the central and most important part of the whole series of acts and words.

The variation in form between Lk $22^{16.18}$, parallel as they are in most respects, is also highly important: 'I say unto you, I will not eat (this Passover), until,' etc., and, 'I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until,' etc. Jesus, as we know, ate the meal, and did not merely give to the disciples to eat, but He did not eat this Passover. Hence, while eating the meal, He says, 'I will not eat the passover, until.' . . . On the other hand, in respect of the wine, which formed no part of the Passover, He

says, 'I will not after this occasion drink until the kingdom of God shall come' (or, as Mark has it, 'until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God'). The variation between the two sayings in Luke seems certainly original; yet it appears not to have been understood and to have been the cause of some difficulty to the earliest historians.

Some minor divergences in the details may be noted. Luke says, 'divide it amongst yourselves,' while Matthew has 'drink ye all of it.' The difference in the verb is doubtless due to varying translations of the Aramaic word used by the Saviour.[1] Mark, on the other hand, changes the imperative to the indicative, 'and they all drank of it': it seems beyond question that here Luke and Matthew preserve the truer form; but the command was followed by the act: some give the command, Mark mentions the act; but each implies the other, and it was sufficient to mention either alone. The divergence between 'shed for many'[2] and 'for you,' though slight, is not easy to explain satisfactorily, though one might easily suggest possible theories. The command respecting the Cup, 'Take this: Divide it among yourselves' (or, 'Drink ye all of it'), is doubtless original; but being as a repetition unnecessary, it was shortened by Mark and Matthew, and omitted in the Church ceremony so far as reported by Luke and Paul. It was necessary in the original action, because there was an interval between the two acts, the Bread and the Cup (as the expression of Luke shows 'after supper,' referring to the time when the wine was ordinarily served after the conclusion of the meal). When the two acts follow immediately one on the other, as in the ceremony, it was unnecessary to repeat the command.

It is needless to say that we must wholly and absolutely reject any theory which assumes that Luke had only Mark as an authority, and that divergences from Mark are to be explained as interpolations made in his text on the authority of Paul's account in First Corinthians. No such theory is sufficient; for it affords no explanation of the prophecy regarding the Passover which Luke, and Luke alone, records; and in other respects it fails to explain the literary facts.

As there are two accounts which we have found united by Luke, we might perhaps expect that he would put first that which he took as the standard, namely, vv.[19. 20], and afterwards append the subsidiary account so far as he retained it. Such was the case in the Old Syriac Version of the Sinaitic Codex (recovered and published by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson). Now the Sinaitic Syriac seems undoubtedly to carry us back to a text of Luke existing in the second century: it reveals to us, therefore, an older form of the text than any other authority exhibits. Can we then infer that it gives us the true, original Lucan order, which has been disturbed in the Greek? This is improbable for two reasons: (1) No explanation can account for the change from Sinaitic order to the Greek, if the Sinaitic was original; but there was great temptation to change the Greek order into the Sinaitic, if the Greek was original. (2) The Sinaitic order is not got merely by a simple transposition; it breaks up the two accounts, and mixes them: in short, it is conflate and secondary, while the Greek, in comparison, is primary.

But the great value of the Sinaitic Text in this passage lies herein. It proves, in the first place, that the whole of the second account, as given in vv.[19. 20], was in the Greek text from which the Sinaitic Syriac was translated in the second century; and disproves beyond reasonable question the theory, already utterly improbable on many grounds that the Bezan Text is right in leaving out vv.[19b. 20]. In the second place, the Sinaitic Syriac Text takes us into the midst of the work and thought which were being applied during the second century in the Churches from Antioch to Ephesus to the study of the New Testament, and to the modernization and adaptation of the language of the historical books to the practical needs of the time. The process is precisely the same as we find to have been carried out in the Bezan Texts of *Acts*[3] on a far greater scale.

[1] It is not necessary in a case like this to have recourse to the fashionable theory that Luke misread an Aramaic word. Independent renderings of the same words are quite sufficient to account for the facts.

[2] Matthew's addition 'for remission of sins' is probably explanatory, and not true to the original.

[3] According to the writer's theory (often misstated by its critics) that the Bezan Text of Acts is largely a modernization; but it is founded on a far earlier and in some ways better copy of the book than survives in any MS., and therefore in some cases preserves, or points the way to, a better text than any which we now possess.

The Sinaitic translator (probably working in Antioch) either used a Greek MS. in which already the text had been transposed and remodelled, or he transposed as he translated: the former is the more natural and probable course: the translator merely translated, and we must dismiss as unlikely the other supposition that the translator himself made the transposition. Moreover, the Bezan Revision seems to have been founded on a Text in which the transposition had already been accomplished; and there can hardly be any doubt that the old Text which lies behind that Revision was Greek and of date not later than the second century.

The Bezan editor was also displeased with the account. The double Cup offended him most, and he dropped out the second Cup, leaving the wrong order. Then the process was carried further: the Cup was transposed to follow the Bread, which (owing to the omission) was now possible in a simple way; and this form of text occurs in a very few MSS. The Sinaitic Syriac carries us back to a MS. in which the Bezan omission had not been made.

Our theory, then, as to Luke's authorities at this point, is that he had before him, first, Mark, whose account he regarded as being, not incorrect, but secondary; secondly, the Church Rite, as he had seen it all over the Christian world, everywhere similar;[1] thirdly, a narrative contemporary (as I believe), coming from one of those who were present. But even this last account, though he preserved from it something which was not taken into the Church Rite, was treated by him as subsidiary, and the Rite was the prime authority.

We do not here follow the usual procedure in comparing the Third Gospel with the First and Second. The general procedure is to take everything in the entire Lucan passage that agrees with the accounts of Matthew and Mark as adopted from the common Synoptist source. It then becomes an insoluble puzzle why Luke should put the Cup before the Bread, contrary to the unanimous tradition, and the undoubted order in the rite as actually celebrated.

But it is, of course, certain that in all accounts from every source there would be much agreement. Therefore we must not assume that everything in Luke's account which agrees with Matthew and Mark is derived from a common source. Rather we hold that in both Luke's authorities the order was, first Bread, then Cup; and that excision from the first authority produces the appearance that he gives the reverse order. A too eager desire to be careful, and not to lose any important detail, or to alter any transmitted word,[2] has introduced some confusion into his account.

VI. At this point it will be useful to mention the account given by Justin Martyr of the sacrament as it was celebrated in his time. His conversion to Christianity occurred somewhere under Hadrian's reign, *i.e.* between 117 and 138 A.D.; and therefore his knowledge of the form in which the Rite was celebrated goes back to that time, since it is evident that he was unconscious of any change having taken place in the ceremonial during his own time, and that he confidently regarded the forms as having come down unchanged from the time of the Apostles, *i.e.* from the original institution by the Lord. His evidence is valuable, because he gives both a brief account of the ceremonial as it actually was performed in the Church during his experience and a rough quotation of the record of the Apostles: *οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· 'τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου.' καὶ το ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· 'τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου.'* He regarded this Apostolic record as corresponding in every essential to the ceremony as he knew it in the Church.

In the first place, as to what Justin meant by the Gospels, I think that after much discussion it has now come to be generally accepted that the four canonical Gospels were in existence in his time; and they were therefore meant by him here. It does not follow that he thought all four were written by Apostles; but he took them all as being record of Apostolic authority, and two at least as being

[1] His thought is exactly the same in character as that which was expressed about 192 A.D. by Avircius, Presbyter-Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia (St. Abercius), who describes his travels to Rome on the west, to Nisibis beyond Euphrates on the east, and adds, 'Everywhere I found pledged Brethren,' adding a veiled account of the Rite of the sacred meal, the Fish (*i.e.* Christ) and the Wine, the mixed cup according to the ordinary ancient custom of giving mixed, not pure wine.

[2] To omit part of an authority was not the same as altering it. Omission was freely practised, and was often regarded as right.

actually the work of Apostles. In this case he has in mind the Synoptists. His quotation is only from memory; and it gives in a shortened form the substance of the three accounts which we have. Evidently he thinks of Luke especially. He uses, like Luke, the word 'thank,' not 'bless' (as Mark and Matthew do): he mentions the order to 'do this in remembrance of me,' which Luke alone records; and he uses the phrase 'in like manner,' when he mentions the Cup, implying a repetition of acts and words, as Luke does (but not the other two); though ὁμοίως occurs to his memory in place of the synonym ὡσαύτως, which is Luke's word. He therefore was acquainted with the longer form of Luke's narrative, and not the shorter Western texts, for it seems quite unreasonable to suppose that he followed Paul in preference to the Gospels, summing up loosely an Epistle of Paul among the 'ἀπομνημονεύματα called εὐαγγέλια.'

In the next place, he regarded the varying accounts given by the Synoptists as in essential agreement with one another. He quotes Luke as approaching most closely to the actual Church Rite; but, with the Rite in his memory as a guide, he saw no practical difference between the various accounts. Such is the real fact. The three accounts, when understood in connexion with the Rite, are in perfect agreement; they do not choose the same details for record, but they all imply the same series of acts and words, for the details which they mention require inexorably that the other details, which they omit, must take place. Even the command, 'do this in memory of me,' is, as we saw, presupposed in the narrative of Matthew and Mark and taken for granted as familiar to all. What they record loses almost all its importance, unless it were intended (as Paul says it was) to be the institution of a Rite for future repetition. Hence Justin says that, according to the Apostolic tradition in the Gospels, the command was issued (to do as the Church habitually did): he considers that this command is implied in all the accounts, though he expresses his informal quotation on the lines of Luke, as giving the clearest statement. The account of Matthew and Mark becomes intelligible only through its historic character as the expression of the reason for, and as hinting at the truth embodied in, an established custom of the early Church.

In the third place, Justin clearly distinguishes between the Rite and the Apostolic narratives. He describes the Rite in chap. 65 of his first Apology, and in the following chapter he quotes the narratives as the justification and explanation of the Rite. The narratives are accounts of the historical facts, out of which the Rite originated. They were written by authors who were familiar with the Rite, and who wrote for readers that were familiar with it; and those authors had always an eye to the ceremonial of the Rite, but still they were not describing the Rite: they were describing its historical origin in certain actions of the Lord. This is extremely important in its bearing on their value as historical authorities.

Justin, unfortunately, does not describe so fully as we should wish, the ceremonial of the Rite, nor the words uttered by the celebrant ('him who was the leader among the Brethren,' τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν); but it is interesting to observe two things: (1) The celebrant used words which explain the divergence between Luke on the one hand, and Mark with Matthew on the other hand, as to the opening words. Luke speaks of 'giving thanks,' Mark and Matthew of 'blessing.' Justin says that the celebrant first 'sends up praise and glory to the Father,' etc., and then 'makes a thanksgiving' (εὐχαριστίαν . . . ποιεῖται); the first stage corresponds better to the Marcan term 'bless,' the second to the Lucan term 'give thanks'; and it is clear that (as was stated in an earlier paragraph) both terms are correct descriptions of the words used by Jesus on the historic occasion, and repeated in every celebration of the Rite.

(2) Justin also makes it quite clear that the celebrant spoke at some considerable length. We cannot doubt that much which he said was traditional, being the stereotyped and prescribed repetition of the original words. The proof seems complete that (as we have assumed above) Jesus spoke at far greater length than the Synoptists record. They give only a very brief statement of what they considered the most important details; and no two persons will ever agree exactly in giving a short résumé of the most important points of a series of acts and words. Matthew, though at this point repeating Mark, modifies him in certain points; and we must hold (as above stated) that he did so with the intention of improving him and making his narrative correspond more closely with the Rite.

After all is said, the ceremony as performed in

the early Church stands out more and more prominently as the best and the chief and the sufficient authority for the original facts. Such must be the historian's judgment.

We notice that Justin uses the same word as Paul about the transmission of the record: the Apostles παρέδωκαν, 'handed on the record that an order was given to them.' Similarly, Paul says παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, 'I have handed on the record to you Corinthians.' The trustworthiness of the tradition originating from historical facts and from the words and actions of the Lord is assumed by both writers as the fundamental truth in this matter.

It should not be left out of notice that Justin knew the Rite to be celebrated with the mixed Cup, water and wine (just as Avircius Marcellus in his epitaph, about thirty years later than Justin's death, mentions the κέρασμα μετ' ἄρτου). We cannot, on the principles which guide this investigation, doubt that such was the original form and the fact of the Last Supper; but this is probably to be attributed not to any mystic or hieratic intention, but to the regular and usual custom of the time. The Last Supper was an ordinary meal, which became epoch-making in its consequences and accompaniments; it was served in the customary fashion, with wine after the food had been eaten: this wine was mixed with water, because that was the invariable usage (except among persons who intended to become excited and intoxicated).

Now, according to the fashion which we see acting so effectively in the records, namely, that a series of associated acts might be briefly summed up by mentioning any one of them (as, for example, the Sacrament might be called either the Breaking of the Bread, which is usual, or, for some special reason on a special occasion, the Cup), it was evidently quite possible and natural that the mixed cup of the Rite might be called either the Wine or the Water, or the mixture. Justin exemplifies all these ways of speaking: he calls it first ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, where the water is most prominently mentioned, and the wine is implied (but not expressly mentioned) in κράματος: later he speaks of it as οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, where the wine is most prominent: later he calls it in quotation simply ποτήριον: finally, where he asserts that the Rite has been imitated in the Mithraic religion, he speaks of ποτήριον ὕδατος alone, because the Mithraic rite was celebrated with water only, and yet Justin regarded this as mimicry of the Christian Rite.

It is necessary, therefore, to avoid laying any stress on occasions where water alone is mentioned, or wine alone, as if the early Rite was celebrated with either liquid singly. Doubtless there would have been no difficulty felt in celebrating the Rite with one alone, if the other were not easily procurable: the early Church laid no stress on such petty details, it was the spirit and the general effect, not the material, that was important. But the proper and original form was the mixed Cup; and it is wrong to attempt to press and force testimony into conformity with any theory as to the superior importance of one element in the Cup. This consideration would modify some modern theories on the subject.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament.

1. *Précis de Linguistique Sémitique.* This is a translation into French of Professor Brockelmann's *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft,* which was published in 1906. The translation has been made by W. Marçais, Directeur de la Médersa d'Alger, et M. Cohen, Agrégé de l'Université de Paris (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1910).

2. *Verbesserungen zu Mandelkerns Grosser Konkordanz.* Mandelkern's Hebrew Concordance is a great book. But every concordance contains mistakes, and it is known that Mandelkern's has its share of them. Here is a supplementary volume to lie beside it. Professor Dr. Sven Herner has corrected more than four thousand mistakes (Lund: Hjalmar Möller).

3. *Les Livres de Samuel.* It is surely interesting to learn that a Commentary on the Books of Samuel has been written in Jerusalem. The author, Père Paul Dhorme, is a professor in the École biblique de Saint-Étienne in Jerusalem.

And it is no mean commentary. It contains, first of all, a new translation of the books, a scholar's translation done into idiomatic French, and depending on a thorough knowledge of the difficulties of the text of Samuel and what has been done to resolve them. It contains, next, introductions and a critical apparatus. And, finally, it contains very full notes on the Hebrew text, the most original part of which is the use that is made of Palestinian exploration. But there is scarcely a writer on the Books of Samuel in any department of study, or in any language, that has escaped the notice of this able expositor (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910).

4. *Die Esra-Apokalypse.* This is the title which Dr. Bruno Violet has given to his edition of 2 Esdras. If such a distinctive title could be generally adopted it would be a considerable gain. At present the book is sometimes called 2 Esdras, the title used in the Apocrypha of the Revised Version; sometimes 3 Esdras, as in the Septuagint; and sometimes 4 Esdras, as in the Vulgate.

Dr. Violet's edition, which belongs to the famous series entitled *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, will certainly be accepted, when it is complete, as the standard edition of the book. As yet only the first volume has been published, containing the Latin text and, in parallel columns, the translation into German of all the other texts—Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic (both editions), except the Armenian, which is given in Latin. The introduction to this volume contains an account of the various texts. It is minute and reliable. But this important book must be dealt with at greater length when the second volume appears (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910. M.17.50).

5. *Conférences de Saint-Étienne.* Under this title have been published seven essays of an archæological kind, all written by the professors of the Biblical School of St. Etienne in Jerusalem. The first essay is on Babylonian Origins, by Père Dhorme. In the second Père Lagrange gives an account of the Greek Papyri. The third is an essay on Hebrew Measures in the time of the Gospels. Then come two geographical articles, the first on the Sea of Galilee, the second on Mamre. The last two belong to the history of the Church, the one dealing with the biography of Porphyry, the other with a Patriarch of Jerusalem (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910. Fr.3.50).

Entre Nous.

Skinner's 'Genesis.'

The publication of Skinner's *Genesis* delivers the season of 1909 to 1910 from the charge of mediocrity which has been brought against it. It is a book of amazing learning and as amazing pulpit value. It will increase the reputation of the 'International Critical Commentaries,' a series whose reputation, won by books like Driver's *Deuteronomy*, Allen's *Matthew*, Plummer's *Luke*, and Sanday's *Romans*, is already higher far than that of any series of commentaries in English.

Before going to press we have received another volume of the 'International Critical Commentary.' It is the volume on *The Books of Chronicles*. The Editors are Professor E. L. Curtis of Yale, and Dr. A. A. Madsden of New York.

1 Corinthians vii. 8.

The sentence, 'It is better to marry than to burn' (so in all three common versions, *i.e.* King James's, British, and American Revisions), is an extremely unfortunate translation. For while it is a literal translation of Paul's words, yet the word 'burn' has been generally *assumed* to mean something that was not in Paul's thought. The word he used did *not* mean what this English word 'burn' has been assumed to mean in this place.

The Greek word used here, under our English word 'burn,' is quoted by Thayer, in his *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, as being used six times in the New Testament, three times in the Apocrypha, and five specified times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament; and these he indicates as its only occurrences. Its root meaning is 'to burn with fire, to set on fire, to kindle.'

In these fourteen instances its meaning and usage is as follows: once for 'literal burning,' 2 P 3^{12}; once 'filled with fire,' Eph 6^{16}; seven

times in the sense of 'refining' (*i.e.* five times in the Septuagint, and in Rev 1^{15} 3^{18}); three times 'to be angry, or incensed, or indignant,' in the Apocrypha quotation; once for grief and indignation intermingled, 2 Co 11^{29}; and once in the passage we are talking about.

It will be seen at once that the sexual sense, commonly put into the word 'burn' here, is no part of the original thought of the word Paul uses. And, furthermore, that sense is never associated with it. The word gets its accepted meaning in each case from its connexion. Applying that rule here, it refers to a condition of love which has grown up in two human hearts for each other.

The word 'continency' in v.[9] ('contain' in the common version) should be noticed too. Its more common usage among us is regarding chastity. But the word Paul uses simply means *self-control* regarding all things.

Following now the rule of reading the meaning of words from their connexional use, vv.[8. 9] would read:

([8]) 'But now to the unmarried young people, and to the widowed, I would say this: It is good for them if they remain unmarried. ([9]) But if their affection and longing for a life companion be greater than can with sweet content be repressed, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to be in a state of feverish unrest because of unsatisfied love.'[1]

S. D. Gordon.

Is it I, Rabbi?

Out of the darkness, yearning for the light,
I saw Thy sign and followed from afar,
Until above Thy presence, shining bright,
Hovered the mystic star:
With the poor shepherds, poor to Thee I came,
And the strange pity of Thy new life saw—
Eternity bound in our human frame,
God in a little straw!

Later Thy hand clasped mine, and gently led
My faltering steps to knowledge fairer still:
I knew Thee in the breaking of the Bread,
Knew Thee and loved Thy will.
Yea, I have talked with Thee, seen Thine eyes melt
In pity o'er the sorrows of mankind,
Dipped my hand with Thee in the dish, and felt
Love kindle heart and mind.

Can he that dippeth with Thee, then, betray,
Deny Thee? Ah, what bitter pain were mine,
Should those sad eyes at last be turned away
In agony Divine!
I see Thee hanging on the awful Rood,
I hear Thy mournful, broken-hearted cry:
'One is a traitor.' Oh, ingratitude!
Master, it *is* not I?[1]

Richard L. Mangan, S.J.

[1] *The Quietest Talk* (Fleming H. Revell Co.; 6d. net).

From Boyhood to Manhood.

Mr. David Williamson has written a book for young men, and called it *From Boyhood to Manhood* (R.T.S.; 1s. net). It contains some good advice, and also some good anecdotes. Here are three of the anecdotes:

Dr. Adam Clarke, the Biblical commentator, was famous as an early riser, like most eminent students. A young preacher was anxious to discover how Dr. Clarke managed it. 'Do you pray about it?' he asked. 'No; I get up,' was Dr. Clarke's simple reply.

The Duke of Wellington was once asked who were the best soldiers in the world. He replied, 'The British soldiers, for they are braver for five minutes longer than the others.'

Dr. Gunsaulus, an eminent Chicago preacher, was once preparing a sermon, when his nephew, Will McLaughlin, asked him what it was about. 'I am going to preach on the text, "But for this cause came I into the world,"' said Dr. Gunsaulus. 'I am treating these words of Christ as symbolizing the great idea that each one of us comes into this world for a definite work.'

The young man went out. He was eighteen, a brilliant student, a splendid athlete, and an earnest Christian. As he passed down the street, Will McLaughlin came to the Iroquois Theatre, and as Dr. Gunsaulus was going to preach there next day, he decided to look in. Hardly had he entered than cries of 'Fire!' reached him. In five minutes that new building was filled with flames, and a mass of humanity — struggling, imprisoned, scorched, trampled upon, and finally suffocated—was in dire peril. McLaughlin rushed to the fire-escape opposite the third-storey window of the North-Western University Law School. He stood there, helping seventeen women and children across a narrow plank from the Law School. The

[1] *The Catholic World*, April, 1910.

heat was terrific, his hands were burned terribly, and he was urged to step into safety before it was too late. But suddenly he was thrown down under an avalanche of dead victims of the fire. They carried him into the Law Schools, but even then he thought of others. He raised his poor burnt hand and said to the doctor: 'I am going to die. Give your attention to the women and children, doctor. I am going to die, and I am prepared.'

They sent for his uncle, and as Dr. Gunsaulus sat by the dying hero, he said to the preacher: 'But—but—for this cause came I into the world.' Before death came to Will McLaughlin, he said, 'I knew that I was following Christ, and I could not do otherwise.' The words are now inscribed on a piece of the plank where he stood, and they witness to the life-sacrifice he made so nobly:

The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar:
Who follows in His train?
Who best can drink His cup of woe,
Triumphant over pain,
Who patient bears His cross below,
He follows in His train.

The true story which follows indicates the almost incredible ignorance of missionary history that prevails not simply in the street, but in the Press. *Scene:* A mission-house in London, Monday, May 2, 1910. Telephone bell rings. 'Is that the —— Missionary Society?' 'Yes.' 'Oh, we are *The Daily* ——. We want information about these cannibalistic acts on Savage Island in the Pacific. May we have an interview with Rev. James Chalmers? We understand that he is an expert on cannibals.' 'Very sorry, but Mr. Chalmers was himself eaten by cannibals some time ago.' 'Dear, dear, how very sad! Good day!'[1]

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. Donald Henry, M.A., Whithorn, and the Rev. L. Arpee, Nelsonville, Ohio, to each of whom a copy of Dykes's *Christian Minister* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for August must be received by the 1st of July. The text is Rev 22^{17}.

[1] *Christian World*, May 5, 1910.

The Great Text for September is Ps 1^{3}—'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' A copy of Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Adams's *Israel's Ideal*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Ps 4^{6}:

'Many there be that say, Who will shew us any good?
Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.'

A copy of Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, or Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Inge's *Faith and Knowledge*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Ps $8^{3.4}$:

'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps $9^{9.10}$:

'The Lord also will be a high tower for the oppressed,
A high tower in times of trouble;
And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee;
For thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee.'

A copy of Durell's *Self-Revelation of our Lord*, or two volumes of Plummer's *English Church History*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Mr. D. G. Hogarth, M.A., F.S.A., has published the paper on the Hittites which he read at the Winnipeg Meeting of the British Association in 1909. He has published it in the thirty-ninth volume of the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*.

Mr. Hogarth gives an account of recent Hittite research. He does not review in detail the early history of the Hittite problem. That problem was set before scholars in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the discovery that a West Asiatic people, called the Kheta or Khatti, played an important part in the foreign relations of Egypt and Assyria, together with the further discovery of a class of monuments in a peculiar art and script which were claimed to be the work of that people. It was generally agreed that the Kheta or Khatti were identical with the Hittites of the Old Testament.

The monuments were observed first in Northern Syria. Scholars were accordingly inclined to regard the Hittites and their civilization as primarily Syrian. And so long as this view held the field, they were considered of comparatively small account. But after similar monuments were found in Asia Minor, the estimate of Hittite importance began to grow; and some scholars, notably Professor Sayce, spoke roundly of a 'Hittite Empire.' Presently Ramsay, Perrot, and others agreed with Sayce that the original home of Hittite culture was not in Syria but in Cappadocia.

This was the signal for a great battle, which was fought as only archæologists' battles can be fought. But Mr. Hogarth is able to say that the issue was practically decided four years ago, and in Sayce's favour. For in 1906 the whole Hittite problem was set in a new light by the discovery that the rock-reliefs at Boghaz Koi in North-Western Cappadocia belonged to the Hittite civilization.

The site of Boghaz Koi (as Mr. Hogarth spells the name) was discovered in 1834. It was discovered independently, and almost simultaneously, by Texier and Hamilton. What attracted their attention most was a series of rock-reliefs on the walls of a hypæthral recess in a hillside, a short distance away. Thirty years later Napoleon III. sent an expedition to explore Galatia and Cappadocia, and these rock-reliefs were published. But it was not till 1878 that it was observed by Sayce that the style of the reliefs was identical with what was already known as Hittite art. Then in 1890 Chantre did some digging at the spot. Others followed; and after several applications had been made to the Ottoman Government for leave to

excavate the place, a German application was successful, and Dr. Hugo WINCKLER proceeded to the site of the ancient city in 1906.

A startling revelation ensued. Many tablets were found. One of the fragments contained part of a document, whose tenor was identical with that of the famous treaty made by Rameses II. with Khetasar, King of the Hittites, about 1280 B.C., and inscribed on a wall at Karnak. The Kheta kings named on the wall at Karnak were named also on the Boghaz Koi tablet. The spelling was not exactly the same, but there was no doubt of the identity. Khetasar, who made the treaty, was Hattusil; his predecessor, Mutnara, was Mutallu; the next in ascent, Maurasar or Marsar, was Mursil; and finally Sapalulu or Sapararu, who had treated with Seti I., was written Subbiluliuma.

When other tablets were read, most of which were found in 1907, it was discovered not only that Boghaz Koi had taken part in the conspiracy of the Kheta against Rameses, and that it was a worshipper of the Hittite god Teshup, but that it was the head of the conspiracy and the chief city of Khetasar or Hattusil. It was now beyond question that the tablets belonged to royal archives, that they were the archives of the kings of Boghaz Koi from the fifteenth to the twelfth dynasty B.C., and that the Hatti or Hittites were really a great people, widespread and warlike, who formed an empire fit to cope with the mighty empires of Egypt or Babylon. Subbiluliuma writes to Katashman-Turgu, King of Babylon, not as a vassal, but as an equal, and urges him to take action against a common enemy, conjectured by WINCKLER to have been the rising North Semitic power of Assyria.

Hittite figures carved in the rock near Smyrna cease to be an inexplicable puzzle. SAYCE's contention that Lydia was once a Hittite satrapy passes from the region of much derided speculation into the domain of reasonable inference. The observations of RAMSAY, PERROT, and others, that the earlier Phrygian monuments display strong Cappadocian characteristics, find their justification and their explanation. And Mr. H. R. HALL does not go too far in calling the Hatti the 'type-people of Asia Minor,' and in saying that those conceptions, usages, and the like, which we have long recognized in ancient life as 'Anatolian,' must in future be regarded as in origin Hittite.

There is a great deal that has yet to be discovered about the Hittites. What happened to the Hittites in Syria? How is it that the Amarna correspondence speaks of the Kheta as a danger only to the northern borders of Syria, while the 'children of Heth' are mentioned in the history of Abraham as dwelling at Hebron in the far south, and a fragmentary chronicle of the First Babylonian Dynasty states that the Hatti invaded Southern Mesopotamia about 1800 B.C.? These questions cannot be answered yet. WINCKLER thinks that the Cappadocian Hatti were not the only Hittites, but were part, if ultimately the most important part, of a race once widely distributed over Western Asia. And that, which is the easiest, may be the best way out of the difficulty. But there are other and perhaps greater difficulties than that. There is the difficulty, and supreme surprise, of the Boghaz Koi tablets, that the royal house of Mitani, in the time of Hatti domination, invoked gods who have familiar Aryan names, Indra, Mithra, Varuna, and the Açvin Twins.

The Rev. George HANSON, D.D., delivered the Murtle Lecture in Aberdeen on the 30th of January 1910. And now, through the Religious Tract Society, he has published the lecture, under the title of *The Originality of the Gospel*.

The title is not well chosen. His subject is not the originality of the Gospel, but its uniqueness. When he went to Aberdeen to deliver the Murtle Lecture, Dr. HANSON determined to show that in certain particulars Christianity or the Gospel—for he uses the one word for the other—is separate

from, and superior to, every other form of religion in the world. He determined to show that Christianity is 'unapproachably pre-eminent' in three particulars.

Christianity is pre-eminent in respect of its doctrine of Atonement. That is the first thing. There is a doctrine of Atonement in other religions. There is scarcely a religion on the face of the earth that is without the doctrine or the practice of Atonement. But in every religion, except the Christian, Atonement means the self-sacrifice of man for God's sake. In the Christian religion it means the self-sacrifice of God for man's sake.

The doctrine of Atonement, outside Christianity, may be summed up, says Dr. HANSON, in the words, 'Man so feared God that he offered his best and dearest to Him; if thereby he might turn away His anger.' The Christian doctrine of Atonement is 'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.' These two doctrines are in opposition fundamentally. In the one, man seeks by pain and anguish, often unto death, to reconcile God to him. In the other, God seeks by pain and anguish unto blood to reconcile man to Him. The one idea arises out of man's dread of God, the other out of God's love to man. And these two ideas, though both are gathered under the title of the doctrine of Atonement, are wide as the Poles apart. The idea of God taking upon Himself the burden of the sin of the world, and expiating its guilt at infinite cost to Himself, 'is absolutely undreamt of outside the New Testament.' That is the first thing.

But Christianity is also unique in respect of the conditions of salvation. What are the conditions of salvation? Everywhere but in Christianity salvation is by human merit. In Christianity it is by the grace of God.

In all non-Christian religions, says Dr. HANSON, man earns the divine favour by his own virtues. If he attains to salvation he has himself to thank for it. It is the result of his own exertion. It is his own achievement. And there is no Gospel in good works. But the Christian religion is a Gospel. The Gospel is that the salvation of man is the gift of God. And so free is the gift that no merit in any man can improve it. So free is it that no sin in any man can depreciate it. The Gospel is that the chief of sinners is offered at once, without effort or delay, the place of the chief of saints. That is the second thing.

The third respect in which Christianity is unique is in its doctrine of the Person of Christ. What is that doctrine? It is that *God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.* And that being so, Christ cannot be separated from the Christian religion. Its uniqueness lies in that. It lies in that more than in anything else. For you can separate Muhammad from Muhammadanism, Buddha from Buddhism, Confucius from Confucianism, and these religions will remain religions still. But you cannot separate Christ from Christianity. Christianity is Christ. The messenger here is also the message. The preacher is the sermon. Christ Himself is our peace. He is the way. He does not merely speak to us of immortality. He is the Resurrection and the Life.

'Not long ago,' says Mr. Claude MONTEFIORE, 'I received a letter from one of the greatest Jewish scholars of Germany, in which he differentiates, to the disadvantage of Jesus, between him and the prophets, on this ground that the prophets are so grandly impersonal; they think and speak of God and Israel, and never of themselves.' For this is the distinction between Christianity and Judaism, as between Christianity and every other prophetic religion in the world. And Mr. MONTEFIORE, Jew as he still is, has discovered this superiority. The quotation which we have made is from his new book on *The Teaching of Jesus* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net). The life and the teaching of Jesus, he bravely says, are inseparable. And in spite of the letter of the German scholar, 'Herein,' he declares, 'we may at once observe that Jesus

differs from, or, as some would say, goes beyond, the prophets: "More than a prophet is here."'

The central place now given to the Gospel according to St. Mark in the study of the Synoptics is one of the results of the Higher Criticism which one can point to with unmixed pleasure. It is so sure. It is so welcome. We read St. Mark now as he has not been read in all the history of the Church.

And as we read St. Mark, we are ever more impressed with his naturalness. More than the others, he sees what there is to be seen, and writes that down. When he describes the Feeding of the Five Thousand, he says that our Lord 'commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass.' St. Matthew omits the 'companies'; and both he and St. Luke disregard the greenness of the grass. When he tells the story of the Rich Young Ruler, he alone notices that Jesus 'was going forth into the way,' and that the ruler 'ran to him and kneeled.'

The local colouring gives the scene reality. But it is not the art of the painter; it is the work of the historian. We do not ask, Why did St. Mark say that the ruler ran? We ask, Why did the ruler run?

Why did the ruler run? Dr. Alexander MACKENNAL, a wise, far-seeing student of the Gospels, suggests that Jesus was already on His way before the ruler could overcome his reluctance to seek His spiritual direction. That is very likely. For it meant more than an effort to overcome a natural shyness. It meant a victory over the deep-seated, far-reaching prejudice of his class. The ruler was probably present all the time. All the time, it is probable, an agitating struggle was going on within him. And it is at least possible that what turned the scale at last was the incident of the blessing of the little children.

We may take it that that incident, which immediately precedes in all the narratives, immediately preceded in the course of events. What was it? Certain persons—we are not told that they were 'mothers of Salem,' but we are ready to believe it—brought little children to Him that He should touch them. The idea was very likely a superstitious one. The touch, the mere physical contact with a wonder-worker, has always been held to be good. Try it: you would wonder what good it might do. But the disciples were more enlightened than that. They rebuked those that brought them. And the ruler was looking on.

To his great surprise Jesus disapproved of the disciples' action. He was even moved with indignation. And yet there is no doubt that the disciples were right. If one's actions are to be regulated by rules, if reason is to be the guide of conduct, it is certain that the disciples were right. What astonished the ruler was the fact that Jesus superseded reason, that He set the rules of conduct aside. And His indignation with the disciples was evidence enough that no passing sentimentality moved Him, but a far-reaching motive of life.

As the ruler was considering this, Jesus left the house, passed into the road, and began His journey. The moment had come for decision. Gladly would he have taken time to think. What might this new attitude to law and conduct involve? But at least Jesus was larger-minded than ordinary men. He ran to Him, and kneeled to Him, and asked Him, 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?'

Jesus sent him back to the commandments. A moment before, the commandments were set aside; now they are brought prominently forward. 'Thou knowest the commandments, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery.' It must have been a disappointment, as well as a shock. Is He simply an original then? Does His behaviour mean no more than that it must always be different from the behaviour of other people? When you expect

Him to say, Keep the commandments, does He set them aside? When you come to set them aside, or at least to go beyond them, does He say, Keep the commandments? 'All these have I observed from my youth: *what lack I yet?*'

Jesus was not inconsistent. That is not the way in which He was original. He led the disciples to see that life is greater than the laws that try to measure it. He will lead the ruler to see the very same thing, though in another way. 'All these have I observed.' And He does not doubt it. Then 'Jesus, looking upon him, loved him.' But it is not enough to observe all these. If eternal life is to be gained by observing the commandments, it is necessary to observe more than these. It is necessary to have a rule for every act of life, for every utterance, and for every thought.

Jesus did not say so to the ruler. For that the ruler knew already. In the history of the commandments the Jews had discovered that. And they had tried to meet the difficulty. Is there a heroic effort after righteousness to be compared with the effort these Jewish rabbis made to find a law that would fit every circumstance of life, and insist that every law under every circumstance should be observed? The ruler knew that if he was to obtain eternal life, which is the fulness of righteousness in the sight of God, he must observe not only the weightier matters, but also tithe mint and anise and cummin; he knew that he must not omit one jot or tittle of all the rabbinic refinements which the ages of baffled experience had gathered round the original law.

The man was there at Jesus' feet simply because he knew that, and knew that he had not done it. If he had been able to keep all the commandments, he would have felt no heart-hunger driving him to seek Jesus. 'All these have I observed'; but he was compelled to add, 'What lack I yet?'

And Jesus led him as He led the disciples. It is not in the letter. It is in the spirit. To keep all and yet offend in one—it is at least to lack. It is to find Jesus necessary. But when the commandments are known, not in the letter, but in the spirit, there is nothing lacking.

And how easily could this young ruler be led to know the commandments in the spirit. Is it not expressed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament? Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God, and thy neighbour as thyself. On this hangs all the law. Let the rich young ruler, like the disciples, drop all the minutiæ of regulations and fall back on love, love to God and man, and he has in that moment inherited eternal life.

As to how that is to be accomplished, as to how a man is to learn to love—that depends on the man. For this ruler the way is evident. 'Sell that thou hast and give to the poor.' Between him and the love of God stood the love of 'that he had.' If he can put it out of the way, he will be free to love God with all his heart. And if, in putting it out of the way, he can give it to the poor, he will also be showing that he loves his neighbour.

With the rich young ruler the way was clear. He had to learn to love. But how will it be with those who have already learned to love, but not to love God? Will the love of lover do, the love of husband or wife, the love of children? It will do very well if it is an unselfish love. In all unselfishness he that is not against God is for Him. But if it is a selfish love it will not do. And then sometimes there is no way but the removal of the object of it.

Eyes that the preacher's art in vain hath schooled,
By wayside graves are raised;
And lips cry, God be merciful,
That ne'er said, God be praised.

Christologies Ancient and Modern.

By the Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the New College, Edinburgh.

The late Professor A. B. Davidson is credited with the remark, *à propos* of Dr. Sanday's well-known article 'Jesus Christ,' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, that 'the thing could not be better done.' Since that time we have all been pleasurably aware that Dr. Sanday was invited, and has agreed, to undertake the Life of Christ for the 'International Theological Library.' No one could have been found better qualified for the great task. His preparations have been made slowly; this is the third preliminary volume issued within the last five years, all of them being composed of lectures delivered originally to students of theology, and preserving even in book form much of the informal charm of direct speech. He tells us now that of these introductory studies this is, as he hopes, the last; in his own words, 'It is necessary that I should make clear, as much to myself as to others, the broad lines of the conception which I have formed of the most central portion of my subject—that portion round which everything else really revolves.' Hence in a survey of Christologies ancient and modern, followed by the sketch of an original hypothesis, he seeks to bring out leading principles, unhampered by details, and to state these principles in terms intelligible to the wide general public. In the preface Dr. Sanday affirms anew his belief in the fundamental decisions of the ancient Church, as having been arrived at under the providential influence of God: 'it is to me incredible,' he writes, 'that He should intend the course of modern development to issue in direct opposition to them.' To this general acquiescence the argument of the book is faithful, but it is an acquiescence, as we shall see, which is conceived as quite in harmony with frank criticism of the older phrases, and it goes along with a firm resolve not to 'play fast and loose with criticism.' Dr. Sanday holds that criticism and tradition really meet, though not perhaps within the range of our present instruments of vision. On neither side must there be anything like coercion.

My purpose now is first of all to give a brief running commentary on Dr. Sanday's more important results in historical Christology, and thereafter to devote special attention to his 'new and unexplored' theory that we may find the key to our Lord's higher being in the modern psychological idea of the Subliminal Consciousness. It will be seen that this theory, if sound, will involve some considerable alteration in our thoughts of Christ, and that it cannot be accepted or declined without close scrutiny.

Good people are now and then perturbed by Dr. Sanday's almost clairvoyant appreciation of other points of view, and his plea in the first chapter for the naturalness even of Docetism is a notable instance of that sympathy which makes him one of the most alert and hospitable conservatives. 'Docetism was not all folly. Rather we may regard it as one primitive form of the assertion of that mystical element which has never been wanting to Christianity, from the first days until now' (p. 9). The gospel came from the Orient, and if it is now to be attractively reintroduced to the Oriental mind, and to satisfy its immemorial native forms of thought, its latent mysticism must be allowed for. Docetism and pantheism are both ethically impossible, but on the other hand a Christianity without mysticism is religiously impossible. A docetic view of Christ treats history as moonshine; yet Christ must be so conceived that we may dwell in Him, and He in us. And the Docetics were groping after this. The success of Ignatius' reply to them was owing to his faith in the indwelling Christ as the source of life for all believers.

At more than one point, in this first section, Dr. Sanday comes into friendly collision with men like Harnack and Loofs. They, I imagine, would disown his approving remark that 'the essential principle which underlies the doctrine of the Trinity finds its first expression in a Valentinian writer,' and in his brief estimate of the Apologists he crosses their path intentionally. If Loofs complains that the Apologists by their doctrine of the Logos tended to lower Christology instead of heightening it, Dr. Sanday's reply is that

'sooner or later, it was inevitable that Christianity should be brought into relation with the contemporary philosophy. And, if that was to be done at all, was there any grander idea, already coined and current, than that of the Logos, that could be used for the purpose? Was there any idea with anything like the same sweep and range?' It is well that this should be said, and for a final judgment we no doubt have to consider the further point also that 'the Apologists certainly did not conceive of the activity of the Logos as purely intellectual.' At the same time, Loofs appears to be so far right that St. John and the Apologists come to the Logos-idea from appreciably different points of view. To the one it is a useful philosophic symbol; the pre-existent One normally thought of as *Son* (this is clear, I think, if we take the Prologue and chap. 17^{1-5} together), may for a special didactic purpose be designated as Logos; to the Apologists, on the other hand, the Logos is the influential and paramount idea, distinctively metaphysical, and with at best a neutral relation to concrete history. They interpret Jesus Christ by the Logos; St. John interprets the Logos by Jesus Christ. The chasm is not quite impassable, but for all that it is there.

In some fresh pages on Irenæus and Tertullian I may single out a few particularly well-timed words on the conception of an economic Trinity. No doubt for a real synthesis we are compelled to probe deeper, unless forbidden by a purely relativistic theory of knowledge; we cannot rest content with a Triune Life that is merely provisional or on the surface. But we do well, nevertheless, to note that 'it was right and proper, because it was natural, that the conception should begin in this form.' It not only began in this form historically; it must always begin thus, if it is not to be separated from its basis in history and experience. Nothing we discover afterwards as to the value of the Trinitarian idea for speculation can touch the fact that 'the first impulse to it was given by the belief in the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ; and then as a further step came the necessity to coordinate with this that world-wide movement which all Christians described as the work of the Holy Spirit' (p. 27). So that advocates of what are usually described as 'economic' and 'ontological' views of the Trinity may travel at least part of the way in each other's company. But Dr. Sanday makes no apology for Trinitarian doctrine, nor need we. 'Why should there not be in that abyss which we call "God" some differentiation of being or function which does not amount to division?' As the background to what we know of Christ, of God in Christ, something of this kind is an essential postulate; and if it be said that the description of such distinctions within the Godhead is negative merely, not affirmative, the objection may be conceded, but with the query whether it is one which the Christian theologian has any right to put. Most Christian theologians lay it down that God is *causa sui*, yet when we look into our own minds is that phrase more than negative, however indispensable? It cannot be positively defined, yet we are obliged to grant its truth. There is point in the celebrated Moses Stuart of Andover's reply to Channing, 'When you will give me an affirmative description of underived existence, I may safely engage to furnish you with one of *person* in the Trinity.' Dr. Sanday will carry most of us with him in his severe allusions to Tritheistic forms of doctrine. Had there been less Tritheism, we might have wanted Unitarianism. Strictly we use the word 'person' merely because of the poverty of language; to designate our belief in a real distinction in God, that is, not to affirm independent conscious beings, possessing separate 'essences'; and 'we must never cease to be grateful to St. Augustine for that phrase—*non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur*.'

It was the Christian instinct that vanquished Arianism; but has Dr. Sanday any real ground for saying that this instinct operated unconsciously? His exact words are: 'Such instinctive tendencies are really of no slight moment; they show the working of forces that do not take shape in tangible argument, but are none the less part of that constructive whole to which the unconscious processes of the human mind contribute as much or more than the conscious' (p. 43). The passage is worth noting as indicating a slight bias, more definite in other places, towards what I may perhaps call the glorification of the 'unconscious.' Some of these passages will come up later. Here it is only necessary to urge that naïve and unreflective states of mind need not be at all unconscious. Men do not take sides in controversy except as the result of *some* quite conscious reasonings, however defective such

reasonings may be, and indeed usually are, in a formal point of view.

As regards the definition of Chalcedon, Dr. Sanday pleads in mitigation of the modern hostile tone. He says truly that it was no slight thing to save the integrity and reality of Christ's manhood, even though it were done at some expense of logic. When he says, however, that it is not for us to blame Pope Leo and Pope Martin 'before we have got a coherent and consistent theory of our own that we can substitute for theirs,' he appears to me to suggest a principle which, if taken seriously, would put an end to all criticism of the past. Happily the principle occurs only in an *obiter dictum*, and is freely transgressed by its author in case of need. Two Natures, Two Energies, Two Wills in Christ—such categories 'are no longer as living as they were.' Who can help criticising them, whether he will or not? Among reasonable men, I suppose, there is little more difference here than may be represented by the varied order of words in a sentence. One says: The older language scarcely contents us now, but we should consider that at the time no other solution was possible. Another says: No other solution was possible, doubtless, but the older language must now be modernized. And into either form we may really put as much sympathy and historic sense, I feel, as we are capable of.

Students of nineteenth-century Christology ought to ponder some of the implications of the following passage in the third lecture; Dr. Sanday is at his best in such brief *aperçus*. 'There are in German three related terms which may be used in this connexion, and I think that they may be taken as each marking a distinct step above the other. The terms are Christus-Idee, Christus-Prinzip, and Christus-Person. I would venture to distinguish between them thus. The *idea* is the expression of a general truth; in this case the general truth of the intimate mutual relation of God and man, of Deity and Humanity. It is implied, but not directly expressed, that this idea embodies itself, or works itself out, in history. The term *principle*, as compared with idea, lays more stress on this active working out or realization; it brings to the forefront the fact that the idea is not a mere abstraction of the mind, but a working creative force in history. Both these terms are less heard of than they were. In their place we hear more now of the Christus-Person. I take it that this is a clear gain. We come back at last to the real Christ—historic or (as we should say) supernatural.' As an expository clue to the last hundred years, this could hardly be improved. It not only helps memory but promotes insight. I cannot dwell on the fine feeling of the pages which bring back T. H. Green to us, pages for which Dr. Sanday will be thanked by many. No part of the book is written so plainly *con amore*; and nothing was better worth doing just now, when Green's figure tends to grow dim a little in the dust-clouds of modern philosophic strife. One feels that the treatment of Dorner and the Kenotic theologians is somewhat slight, not to say unfriendly, which is the more surprising that many people would be inclined to put Dr. Sanday himself rather close up to the Kenoticists in ultimate affinity. As a guide to the English literature of the subject, however, these pages (71–78) have much value. It is perhaps time that we should now disengage the principle of Kenosis from the details of its application in the familiar historic theories. When Dr. Sanday remarks that 'the formal theory of Kenosis rests upon an altogether insufficient basis, both biblical and historical,' he appears to be thinking of Thomasius and Gess or of some other detailed hypothesis which almost invites the fatal charge of theosophy, because it professes to explain such things as—even if real—never could be really known to any one. So far as I can see, however, we are brought back irresistibly to the idea of a real Kenosis—not merely Kenosis 'in a sense'—by motives which at bottom are genuinely religious. Somehow we must get into our theory the wonder of Christ's self-abnegation; the fact that in love He gave up qualities or conditions of a former being, gave them up besides by a real surrender, which was incompatible with His yet retaining them at a different centre of consciousness. And if we be asked what these qualities were, only the historic record of His life, I think, can tell us. He gave up whatever was necessary to His becoming *that*. At various points in his argument Dr. Sanday implies approval of the modern view that the life of Jesus was veritably human, and that—it is really a second aspect of the same thing—there were in Him not two consciousnesses or two wills, 'but a fundamental unity of experience; that, to quote Bishop Weston, 'the importance of arriving at a conception of a single consciousness of the Christ cannot

be overestimated.' But how to think these two data together—the true manhood and the single consciousness—without the postulate of an actual Kenosis, involving much more than 'the external circumstances of majesty and glory,' I confess to finding it always more difficult to understand.

The estimate of Ritschlianism is very much done from the inside. How sympathetic it is the following sentences prove. 'The formula on which [the Ritschlian] insists, and will insist as much as we please, is contained in those words of St. Paul's, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself" (2 Co 5^{19}). His assent to this is whole-hearted. . . . To find Christ or be found of Christ, is to find God or be found of God; to be in touch with Christ is to be in touch with God, and to feel His presence in the soul. That is the religious nucleus of Ritschlianism, in regard to which, as I said just now, it is quite whole-hearted. And I confess that to me this profession of faith, brief and guarded as it is, is of immense value. I am not sure that it is not really the essence of everything' (pp. 104–105). This is surely as far as sincere mediation and compromise could go; and the difference which after all does remain is rather theological than religious. But the question we have still the right to put, is just whether the Ritschlian gets as much truth out of this absolute religious conviction as it actually holds. If faith is in touch with ultimate reality, and if for faith Jesus and God are one, the right inference would appear to be that the dualism introduced between Christ and God by the logical understanding is only provisional and temporary—one more consequence indeed of the fact that life, by its very idea, is the perpetual despair of thought, which comes halting slowly in the rear of vital experience. Jesus and God *are* one, alike for simple faith and for the ideal Dogmatic that shall transcend the oppositions of discursive thinking. *À propos* of Ritschl, by the way, is it quite correct to say (p. 83) that there is nothing distinctive in his treatment of the categories of Prophet, Priest, and King? It has usually been regarded as a happy originality in him to take the Kingship as the superior conception, with Prophetship and Priesthood as joint aspects or subdivisions; Christ being Priest in so far as He dealt with God for us, Prophet in so far as He dealt with us for God, and the title in each case covering the *whole* of what He was and did. This is a great advance on anything that had been tried previously.

Again, the Ritschlians perhaps too much figure in Dr. Sanday's pages as a single homogeneous group. There are really very considerable differences; Haering and Julius Kaftan, for example, would say a good deal as to the pre-existence of Christ which Harnack and J. Weiss would incline strongly to disown. Apart from this, however, Dr. Sanday looks upon the Ritschlian point of view as illustrating one of the two main types of contemporary Christian thought. Of these he writes: 'I will call the one "full Christianity," and the other "reduced Christianity"; and each of these, as it seems to me, has a Christology of its own.' Roughly it may be said that the reduced Christianity confines itself to the Synoptics; the fuller type takes in all the rest of the New Testament, and particularly writers like St. Paul and St. John. Both parties might conceivably meet on the ground of the brief creed suggested by Dr. Denney from the 'fuller' side; but the distinction of the one reading from the other is by no means to be minimized. It would be fairly correct to say that the radical group are unanimous in discarding the mysticism of the New Testament; the apostolic emphasis on 'something *inclusive* in the life and mission of our Lord,' and even our Lord's own consciousness of His own universal and representative character, are scarcely permitted to have weight. Dr. Sanday quotes from Moberly and Du Bose memorable passages which bear out his own strongly mystical interpretation of all such Biblical data, adding that 'there was a time when I should have very much hesitated to give any kind of endorsement to this teaching myself.' Now it seems to him to be after all nothing more than a Christian application of the idea of Divine Immanence. Not only so; it furnishes 'an analogy which may go some way to explain other difficulties of the Incarnation.' What follows is important. 'The presence of this divine element, whatever it is—the Christian would say, the working of the Holy Spirit even in its highest degree—is seen to be no wise incompatible with the fullest humanity. . . . The full recognition of this fact will determine the shape of that constructive attempt at a modern Christology that I hope to offer' (pp. 132–133). Already we can see that the two predominant ideas in Dr. Sanday's new reading of our Lord's Person are

going to be those of the Mystic Union and the Subliminal Self, if indeed he would concede that they are two ideas, and not rather one. But the exposition of this theory in more detail, with whatever criticism may offer, must be deferred.

Looking backward, we can see that we have been under the leadership of a singularly and congenially appreciative mind. 'I am perhaps conscious of a certain call to offer to mediate,' are the writer's own words. This sympathy and knowledge are manifest throughout, and they enable him to be always courteously conciliatory without being complaisant. No wonder he is so widely trusted. True sympathy and a feeling for the delicacies of spiritual thought are, if not rare, at any rate never too abundant. Though much less common than before, the *hard* type of divine is still with us; sagacious, shrewd, circumstantial, business-like, sceptical of everything that cannot be set down instantly in plain words. Paley, as a fond admirer once happily expressed it, 'had the credit of putting Christianity into a form which could be written out at examinations.' Now of all this Dr. Sanday is the antipodes: he has no dry, stony confidence in arguing with other men, never treats ideas as if they formed a fixed, dead skeleton, refuses to ignore the delicate organic laws of growth and change. At least I have noted but one exception to this rule of sympathy. That exception is Luther. He is mentioned only once, a little unkindly; and of his contributions to the interpretation of Christ there is not a word. And yet it is not too much to say that with the Reformation, and particularly with Luther, there came into the world a richer and more profound, because a more religious, understanding of our Lord's Person than had been known since the Apostles.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

Revelation xxii. 17.

'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.'

There are two kinds of 'coming' in this verse. There is the coming of the Saviour, and there is coming to the Saviour. First there is the invitation to the Lord Jesus Christ to come. The invitation is addressed to Him by the Spirit and the bride, and every one that hears is invited to join in it. And then there is the invitation to come to the Lord, or, as the expression is, to 'take the water of life freely,' an invitation which is addressed first to 'him that is athirst,' and next to 'whosoever will.' So we have—

I. The Invitation to Christ to come.
   1. From the Spirit.
   2. From the Bride.
   3. From the Hearer.

II. The Invitation to the Sinner to come to Christ.
   1. To the Thirsty One.
   2. To every one that is willing.

I.

The Invitation to Christ to Come.

The invitation is given (1) by the Spirit, (2) by the bride, and (3) by the hearer. The Spirit and the bride are not identical, as if the Spirit simply spoke through the bride, that is, the Church. And yet the writer of the Apocalypse does not mean that the Spirit, as the third Person in the Trinity, gives the invitation directly to the second Person to hasten His coming. By the Spirit, St. John means those who are specially endowed with the spirit of wisdom and of utterance. There was in the early Church a distinct order or school of 'prophets' to whom the word of the Lord came, as it came to the prophets of the old dispensation. But it did not come from without. The word was in their heart. It was the Spirit within them; it was the Spirit of God expressing itself by them. People, says Dr. W. M. Macgregor, had the wisdom and the courage in those days to believe that in their lowly gatherings the voice of God was sometimes heard. When plain men spoke above themselves, in words all depth and fire and essential insight, speaking so as to catch their

fellows up to God, it was reverently confessed that the Spirit of God was speaking; and on the lips of these men who for the moment had the inspired utterance, the recurring word was 'Come, Lord Jesus.'[1] Then the bride, the whole Church of Christ, joined in the invitation. And last of all the hearer, every hearer of this book; not only the Church in her ideal unity, but each individual member of every Christian congregation where the book shall be read is invited to demand the fulfilment of the Lord's promise, 'Behold I come quickly.'

1. The Invitation of the Spirit.—'The Spirit says, Come.' It is true, indeed, that the spirit of this world and age does not speak thus. The more it strives after ease and comfort in this life, the further it is from wishing to have the present state of things ended by the coming of the Lord. But the Spirit of God and of Christ, which is meant here; the true spiritual life-throb of the children of God; the power of faith and salvation, of hope and patience, by which they fight their way victoriously through this world; this Spirit cries at all times, Come, Lord Jesus; come to our aid in every difficulty; come and advance Thy kingdom; even by the very obstacles raised by Thine enemies, come, and by Thine advent make an end to all sorrow and suffering! This Spirit, emanating as it does from eternity, implants in our hearts a holy longing after this eternity, and is itself the innermost strength of this holy longing, of this love for the Lord and His appearing. It is this same Spirit which creates a deep yearning for freedom from all the bonds of sin and death, and for entire unity with the Lord; which creates the burning desire to see the Church of Christ healed of all schisms and corruption, and the honour of the glory of the Lord made manifest before the whole world, and incontestably established for all eternity. Thus does the Spirit continually incite to the prayer, 'Come, Lord Jesus!' The Spirit cries and prays through the mouth of the Church, and in this cry the Church, in unison with the Spirit, pours forth her whole longing and yearning, as in Jn $15^{26.\ 27}$, 'The Spirit shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness.'

2. The Invitation of the Bride.—'And the bride says, Come!' This is not indeed the heart-cry of the whole visible Church; for in so far as she allows herself to be rocked to sleep by the spirit of this world, she becomes, with all her hopes and wishes, so completely a citizen of this world that she wishes the day of the Lord may long be delayed, until she herself has enjoyed life. Therefore *she* does not say, or at least does not say from her heart, 'Come, Lord Jesus!' But the bride who has given herself wholly to the Lord, who keeps the covenant of faith which she has made with Him, and as His betrothed keeps herself unspotted from the world, who knows full well that the good things of this world are fair but poor and perishable, who knows that by the appearing of her Beloved a time of unclouded, endless joy and glory will dawn for *her*, *she* it is who says and prays with earnest longing, 'Come, Lord Jesus!'

Who is 'the Bride'? A beautiful body, knit together in one holy fellowship, pure and spotless, spotless in God's eyes for His sake who loves her, 'arrayed in the fine linen, which is the righteousness of the saints,' and decked with the ornaments of grace. She has accepted Christ for her Beloved, and is bound to Him in a perpetual covenant, never to be forgotten. In Him she has merged her name, her nature, her property, her being; while He pays all her debts, pledges Himself for all her wants, sustains her with His arm, satisfies her with His love. It is the Church, elected by grace, united by faith, sealed by baptism, kept by mercy, prepared for glory.

The Bride is represented here on earth. The Bride is represented there in glory:

> One family we dwell in Him,
> One Church above, beneath;
> Though now divided by the stream,
> The narrow stream of death.

But, whether it is here on earth or yonder in glory, still the Bride speaks one language. Wherever you meet with a soul in whom there is the spirit of the Bride, and who belongs in God's eternal foreknowledge to that elect company, you will find one whose life is a continuous invitation; for, wherever the Bride is, she still seems to say, 'Come.'[2]

3. The Invitation of the Hearer.—Not all the Lord's people are prophets, not all within the Church are sharers in its hope, but there ought to be a process of infection by which the outsider in these matters begins to be interested at second hand, as it were, interested not in the object itself, but, at least, in his neighbour's interest. Many come by that way to the knowledge of Christ. On Stephen's face Paul saw a light which should not

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 264.

[2] W. H. M. H. Aitken, *God's Everlasting Yea*, 242.

have been there if the Sanhedrin's view of the martyr were the true one; but 'light there was from far-off fountains' hid from Paul, making death itself a new and radiant thing. That caught Paul's eye and fretted his sense of what was fitting, but it also set him questioning; and one day he discovered the source of that strange brightness, and it seemed to him like the first day of creation, as fresh and startling as if a man had never looked on light before. That is how ideas move. They are like the seeds of plants meant for the winds to bear, scattering themselves by suggestion, not by direct instruction. There are eyes that look in the Church, and ears that listen; and the power and the awe of great sincere desires are felt by many who are not yet Christians in the deeper sense. A Church which comes to meet them half-way, on a footing of familiarity and lightness, has little power with men; but those who grow up in an atmosphere of noble longings are silently constrained to set amongst the objects of their own desire something of the same order. Though they cannot yet say, Come, they envy those who can; and thus they are drawn by admiration nearer to the Christian temper.[1]

'Let him that heareth say, Come.' I do not know of a better evangelist than a fresh convert. When the love of God is first shed abroad in our hearts, and we receive the fulness of His first blessing, it is so natural that we should go and tell other people of what the Lord has done for us. About three weeks after a mission had been held in the north of England, the mission preacher paid another visit to the neighbourhood, and asked those who had received benefit to meet him in the schoolroom of the church. One of the very first to come forward was a little boy. He came forward like a man, and held out his little hand and grasped the mission preacher by his. His eyes were sparkling with joy. 'Well, my dear boy, how are you getting on? Have you been doing the part of a mission preacher?' 'Yes,' said the boy; 'and now, sir, we are all of one mind in our house, mother and brothers and sisters, all except father, and *we are bound to have him too.*'[2]

II.

The Invitation to the Sinner to come to Christ.

Here we have a remarkable change. We pass at once, and quite abruptly, from an invitation to Christ to hasten His coming to an invitation addressed to those who are thirsty, and those who are willing, to come to Christ. It is as if the writer had intended to ask the thirsty one and every one that had any good will at all, to join in the welcome to the coming Christ, and then suddenly remembered that that could not be until they knew Christ. So he turns his sentence into an invitation to them to come to Christ, that they may taste and see how gracious the Lord is. Then will they be ready to welcome His coming.

1. The Invitation to the Thirsty One.—There is no animal craving so fierce and so intolerable as the craving of thirst. This may be due to the fact that the deprivation of liquid is a condition with which all the tissues sympathize. Every atom of the body joins in the cry, and the expression is concentrated in the parched mouth, and the dry and feverish lips. And this great craving of thirst is used in this book to symbolize the craving of the soul, and these plenteous waters are used to shadow forth the abundance of the satisfaction which is found in the Lord Jesus Christ.[3]

A man felt this thirst, but was too proud to come. One evening after his wife had gone to a revival meeting, he was restless and walked the floor. His little girl asked, 'What ails you?' 'Nothing,' he said; but still he walked the floor. The girl, in her artless way, asked, 'If you were thirsty, would you not go and get a drink of water?' He felt that it was God saying, 'Let him that is athirst come.' He put his hat on, went to the meeting, and before he returned drank deeply from the water of life.[4]

Will anything allay this thirst? 1. Not *sin*. The wonderful thing is that we can ever persuade ourselves that it can. But the devil can mix the most insidious potions and can make them sparkle like the water of life, but when we drink them it is as though a man consumes salt water to appease his thirst. Animal gratification can never quench a spiritual craving. It is the most pathetic of all tragedies when a man or woman flees to drink to quieten his soul. It shall be 'as when a thirsty man dreameth, and behold he drinketh; but he awaketh, and behold he is faint, and his soul hath appetite.'

2. Nor *work*. I will join any man, says Jowett, in singing a pæan of blessedness on work; but if hard work will lead to spiritual contentment, the great majority of my congregation will be in the enjoyment of spiritual rest. And yet after the

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 270.
[2] W. H. M. H. Aitken, *God's Everlasting Yea*, 245 f.
[3] J. H. Jowett, in *The British Congregationalist*, September 24, 1908.
[4] W. Armstrong, *Five-Minute Sermons to Children*, 112.

hardest day's work, often in the midst of it, there is a sigh, a weariness, a state of staleness, a certain out-of-jointness, which is abundant proof that the old craving is still there like a smoking volcano, and that its inner fires are not yet quenched. Thank God for work, but work can never take the place of God.

3. Nor *money*. The most awful weariness in the world to-day will be found where money abounds. The fact of the matter is, spiritual satisfaction is to be obtained at a counter where money is not accepted as a means of exchange. 'Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God can be purchased with money.'

4. Nor *honour*. Satisfaction cannot be found even in the higher and finer cultures of the mind, in music and art and literature. These ministries can soothe, they can excite, they can gratify, but they cannot satisfy; and when the volume is closed, when the harmonious strains have died away, when the creations of art have been laid aside, the secret yearning asserts itself, and the unsatisfied soul cries out, 'I thirst!'

5. 'If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink.' The Lord Jesus claims to satisfy the soul; yes, to satisfy the soul as a babe is satisfied to find its mother's breast. 'The water that I shall give shall be in him a well.' The Lord creates a new well of peace and fruitful satisfaction. For, look you, solid satisfaction lies in the possession of a certain quality of spirit. What is that spirit? What sort of gift would send this congregation away in radiant triumph? If God were now to give me the choice as to what every member of this congregation should receive before we leave the building, what would I choose? I think I would choose three things. First of all, pardon; forgiveness for all our ill doings and all our wasted treasure. Secondly, purity; the washing away of all stains, the searching out of hidden germs and defilement. And thirdly, peace; the sense of the glorious at-one-ness with the glorious God. And if we obtained those three gifts, we should all go away with feet like hinds' feet. And these are just the gifts to be found in Christ. 'Let him come unto me and drink.' We should find pardon; 'in whom we have the forgiveness of sins.' We should find purity; 'He hath washed us from our sins in His own blood.' We should find peace; 'My peace I give unto you.' He is the fountain of these secrets of blessedness. 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters.'[1]

2. The invitation to every one that has any will to come.—Behind the thirsty there is yet this other class who are invited to come—those who are willing. Willingness to receive the truth may exist where as yet there is no thirst for it, and such willingness is of God, and a first step towards eternal life.

This seems to include every one. But it does not. It excludes a great many persons. 'Whosoever *will*, let him take the water of life freely.' The Bible invitation turns on the human will. It invites every man that chooses, but there it stops. The Bible rests on the assumption that every man, if he enters into life, must enter into it by his own free choice.

God pays His child no finer compliment than when He trusts him with his destiny. There must be something inexpressibly great in man to merit this surpassing confidence. True, God was held by the alternative of making a race of automatons or a race endowed with choice; and He made the latter. It was counted that such a creature was worth all the cost of pain and woe, of evil and despair; worth the cost of Calvary. But God leaves us not alone: a highway of truth is blazed by revelation, sweet voices counsel us to walk thereon, an inner Spirit offers holy motive, and a Saviour takes the thrust of an avenging sword. Above, below, around, within us tender help is proffered; but no power may touch with lightest hand the sceptre of the soul. There in the throne-room man is master. A thousand ministries from heaven wait his nod; a thousand demons from the pit attend his will.[2]

If you ask me why the Queen is upon the throne, I reply in the words she insists should be on all her coins, 'Dei Gratia'—by the grace of God. But, on the other hand, if you ask me why yonder criminal is in the cell, I dare not reply, By the will of God; but I say, Because he has done wrong; and I insist that he is morally responsible, else you must not shut him up as a criminal. You may confine him as a lunatic, as one who is dangerous to society; but do not punish him as a criminal for what he had no power to avoid. No, these two things are quite compatible—the Divine sovereignty and the free agency of man; and herein consists the glory of God. He performs His purposes not by mere machines, but by living moral agents, who have this power of will. We all acknowledge that the power of the statesman, who moulds the will of the people, is of a higher

[1] J. H. Jowett, in *The British Congregationalist*, September 24, 1908.

[2] C. G. Doney, *The Throne-Room of the Soul*, 11.

order than the power of a blacksmith, who moulds a dead, resistless piece of iron to his purpose. So God carries out His own will, though liable to be crossed at every turn by the will of man.[1]

The Water of Life.—When we are roaming through the Bible we are never far away from the sound of waters. We have not gone far before we discover 'a fountain of water in the desert'; there are wells on every hand; water gushes forth out of the rock of flint. Away in the Psalms there is 'a river which maketh glad the city of God'; we sit in the shadow of trees which are planted by the flowing streams. In Isaiah there are 'wells of salvation'; rivers breaking out in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys; the wilderness becomes a pool, and the dry land springs of water. And so on by the 'great waters' of Ezekiel, and the clear, strong mountain streams of Amos. On by the well of 'living water' in John, to the sunlit fountains of the Apocalypse. Yes, the sound of the book is as 'the sound of many waters,' and we are never beyond the reach of their voice. And so everywhere there is a promise of refreshment, of satisfaction, the offer of sweet, plentiful waters to allay the thirst of man.

The spiritual drink comes from the Spiritual Rock, says Paul, on which Bengel's comment is, 'Qualis Petra, talis aqua,' what the Rock is in quality that also is the water which comes from it. So when you gaze on Christ and realize what He is, you may be well assured that from Him no mean or meagre gift can come, but one which will give life and death another look.

In the desert when a caravan runs short of water they sometimes send the swiftest camel with its rider forth to seek for it. And the camel's unerring instinct guides it in the direction of the well. When it is nearly out of sight—only a speck on the horizon, they send out another camel and its rider, and when he is afar, they send another and another, and another. And when the first camel reaches the wells, its rider leaps to earth, and stoops and tastes the water to see if it is sweet, and if it is, he mounts once more and turns and waves his hand to the next rider, and shouts, 'Come!' and when he sees the signal and hears the shout, he wheels and rides back, crying, 'Come!' and the next man does the same, and the next, and the next, until the desert rings again with shouts of 'Come, Come, Come!' and the travellers rise and hasten gladly to the living spring.

Freely.—We use the word 'freely' for that which is given without money and without price. It is opposed to all idea of bargaining, to all acceptance of an equivalent, or that which might be construed into an equivalent. A man is said to give freely when he bestows his charity on applicants simply on the ground of their poverty, hoping for nothing again. A man distributes freely when, without asking any compensation, he finds it more blessed to give than to receive. Now God's love comes to men all free and unbought; without our having merit to deserve, or money to procure it. I know it is written, 'Come, *buy* wine and milk,' but is it not added, 'Without money and without price'? 'I will love them freely'; that is, 'I will not accept their works in barter for my love; I will not receive their love as a recompense for mine; I will love them, all unworthy and sinful though they be.'

The Trevi Fountain stands in a busy part of Rome. It is in the Strangers' Quarter, but also not far from the Palace of the Quirinal, where the King of Italy resides. It is one of the sights of the city which every tourist goes to see. The present structure is built as a front of marble to one of the old Roman palaces, and was completed in the year 1762. The water gushes out with great force, and the basin into which it is poured fills nearly the whole of the public square. The aqueduct yields daily at its three outlets thirteen million cubic feet of water. 'It is interesting,' says a recent writer, 'to watch the people flocking to the Trevi Fountain. People from the country are there: they are thirsty, and turn aside to quench their thirst. Maidens from the city are there, carrying their pitchers, and bearing them away, when filled, on their heads. The cigar dealer from his shop stands side by side with an English lord. The fruit woman from her stall has as her next companion a grandly dressed duchess. Newspaper boys, travellers, young and old, rich and poor, are all at the fountain, and they have an equal right to it. It is free to all.'[2]

Whosoever will.—'Thank God,' said Richard Baxter, 'for that "whosoever." Had it been—"Let Richard Baxter take," I might have doubted if I were meant; but that "whosoever will" includes me, though the worst of all Richard Baxters.'

A visitor to Dr. Horatius Bonar's church (about 1876) says: 'His address was founded on the words "The Spirit and the bride say, Come"—"the last invitation in the Bible." It was marked by the absence of all attempt at originality. It was simply an invitation—warm, loving, urgent. With one of the most winning faces I ever saw, he closed: "Whosoever—that includes *you*: whosoever *will*—does *that* include you?"'

[1] E. A. Stuart, *Children of God*, 162.

[2] C. Jerdan, *Pastures of Tender Grass*, 255 f.

On Maps of Palestine containing Ancient Sites.

By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

In the ordinary course of things, if one wants to know the position of some not very well-known place, one looks it out in a map, and with the help of an index the place is quickly found, and there is no more question about it. By this simple method, the site of any place, sufficiently important to be upon the map at all, be it in the remotest corner of the world, is readily ascertained. But maps of Palestine are unfortunately unlike the maps of any other country; and the appearance upon one of them of a given place is no guarantee whatever that it ever existed on the site shown. In other words, nearly every map of Palestine contains a greater or less number of purely imaginary sites.

I will demonstrate this by the examples of Luḥith and Jazer, both mentioned in the prophecy of Moab contained in Is 15–16. It must be obvious that any description of the movements of an army or other body of men becomes much more intelligible and real, if the course taken by them can be followed on the map: so the first question which a student of Is 15–16 naturally asks himself is, Where were the places mentioned in it situated? Let us see what help the maps give us on the sites of Luḥith and Jazer.

It must be admitted at the outset that the most recent English maps of Palestine are particularly liberal in the matter of Luḥith, for they offer us *two* sites for it. In G. A. Smith's large map of Palestine, the 'Ascent of Luhith' is placed just W. of Nebo, E. of the north end of the Dead Sea. In Armstrong's *Names and Places in the O.T. and N.T. and Apocrypha*, published by the P.E.F., Luḥith is located in the same place, with a mark indicating that the discovery of the site is a gain due to the explorations of the P.E.F., and without any indication whatever that the identification is insecure. But in the map at the beginning of the invaluable *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by Dr. Hastings, while Luḥith (in type indicating that it is a *modern* name) is placed here, Luith (in type indicating that it is an *ancient* name,—though, of course, the two forms are in reality just the same name differently spelt) is placed 30 miles to the S., a little E. of the Lisān, or tongue of land projecting into the Dead Sea, on the site of the modern 'Sarifa.' The map of Palestine in Murray's Classical Maps gives the southern Luith in the same position, but is silent as to the Luḥith in the north. In none of these maps is there any mark of interrogation, or other note, indicating doubt as to the correctness of the sites. As, however, it is too much to believe that the same place had two sites, the intelligent reader of Isaiah's prophecy on Moab, with this *embarras de richesses*, must pursue his investigations further, so as to discover, if possible, which of his authorities gives the more probable site.

The *northern* site is adopted presumably from the P.E.F.'s 'Old and New Testament Map of Palestine' in 20 sheets, on the scale of $\frac{3}{8}$ in. to the mile, containing the names of both modern sites and their supposed ancient equivalents. The 'Ascent of Luith' is marked in it, as on G. A. Smith's map, without any indication that it is doubtful. But what are the grounds on which the identification rests? To discover these, we must turn to the *Survey of Eastern Palestine*, published by the P.E.F., pp. 228, 253. We there learn that the modern name of the place is *Ṭal'at Heisah*, the 'Ascent of Heisah' (طلعة حيسة: the map in *D.B.*, in giving the modern name as *Luḥith*, is thus incorrect), or, with the art., *el-Heisah*; and this, we are told, 'may be a corruption of the Heb. Luḥith' (!). In this equation, phonetics and probability are nowhere. The ascent of Luḥith, it is added, 'might very well be that leading up to the plateau near Nebo.' And so it might equally well be an ascent leading up to any other plateau or height in Moab. These, however, are the flimsy reasons upon which alone, so far as appears, in the P.E.F. map mentioned Tal'at Heisah is identified, as a *certainty*, with the ancient Luḥith! That such reasons should have satisfied the accomplished and judicious author of the *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* and of *Jerusalem*, is more than can be credited: we can, rather, only suppose that his attention was not called to the point, and that he accepted without inquiry the identification of the P.E.F.

The *southern* site for Luḥith, we learn from

Buhl, *Geographie*, p. 272, was first suggested by De Saulcy.[1] Eusebius, in his *Onomasticon* (276. 43), makes the important statement that in his day there was a village between Areopolis and Zoar called *Loueitha*. The site of Areopolis is known: it is the modern *Rabba*, E. of the Dead Sea, a little S. of the parallel 31° 20′ (see G. A. Smith's map; in the P.E.F. map, the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, identified wrongly with Ar-Moab).[2] The site of Zoar has been disputed; but, whatever may have been the site of the Biblical Zoar, the Zoar known to Eusebius, like the Zoar known both to Josephus and to the mediæval Arabs, was, beyond question (see ZOAR in *D.B.*), at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. 'As now the old Roman road from the E. coast of the Dead Sea to the Moabite plateau passed through the Wady Beni-Ḥammād, N. of Kerak [see G. A. Smith's map, with the note at the end of this article], we shall have to seek the ancient Luḥith there, perhaps in the considerable ruins of Sarfa, described by De Saulcy, on the uppermost terrace of the mountain edge. Whether, however, the name of the mountain on which they lie, *Jebel en-Nouêhin*, or *Nouêhid*, is, as he supposes, connected with Luḥith, the ancient name of the city, is very questionable. Everywhere there are clear traces of the old Roman road with its walls on the sides' (Buhl, p. 272).

Without in the least relying upon the doubtful identity of the name, the site thus suggested would seem, from the description, to be not unsuitable as a *conjectural* site for Luḥith. De Saulcy describes his route minutely. He comes up from the Dead Sea to Adjerrah (or el-Djerrah); proceeding thence in a N.E. direction, he reaches a spot where there is a well, Bir el-Ḥafayeh, on his right, and, about 3 kils. in front, the Jebel en-Nouêhin (or Nouêhid), at the top of which the elevated Moabite plateau begins. Ascending the lower plateaus of this mountain, and turning to the S., he soon passes on his right the ruins of Ḥafayeh (called also by the Bedawin *el-Djerrah*), where he passes the night. Next morning he climbs up the rest of Jebel en-Nouêhin, and reaches the Moabite plateau; here, on his left, begin the extensive ruins of Sarefah, through which his route passes for some distance, having parallel to it, on the right, hardly 150 metres off, the Wady ebni-Hamid. After emerging from the ruins of Sarefah, he proceeds in an E. and N.E. direction towards Foukoua and Shihan, the Wady ebni-Hamid diverging towards the S., and soon being as much as 2 kils. on his right. The entire route from Adjerrah to Shihar shows extensive remains of an ancient paved road, with walls on each side; there are also many ruins, besides those mentioned, showing that the region was once well populated.[3]

When, however, we take the detailed and, apparently, carefully constructed map[4] of Alois Musil, accompanying his elaborate work, *Arabia Petræa*[5] (1907), and endeavour to trace on it the route thus circumstantially described, we find it, strange to say, impossible to do so. Shihan is there (about 12 kils. north of Rabba); there is a Faḳu'a (obviously = Foukoua), about 5 kils. W. of Shihan; and 6½ kils. S.W. of Faḳu'a there is Ḥafāyer el-Jerra, which must correspond to the 'Hafayeh,' also called 'el-Djerrah,' of De Saulcy; but here the correspondence ceases.' There is no 'Jebel en-Nouêhin' or 'Nouêhid' at all. Sarefa, which De Saulcy places very near Hafayeh, on the N.E., is in Musil's map a little S. of E. of it, and apparently on a different height altogether; and, most remarkable of all, W. Beni-Ḥammād (which must be De Saulcy's W. ebni-Hamid), instead of being only 150 metres to the S. of Sarefah, is 6 kils. (nearly *four* miles) to the S., and separated from Sarefa by another considerable wady (Seil el-Minḳa'a) as well! The wady which De Saulcy ascended to Sarefa seems to correspond to one on Musil's map, called on p. 89 Wady Jar'ûb, leading up from the Dead Sea to Ḥafāyer el-Jerra: certainly the W. Beni-Ḥammād does not lead up in that direction at all, but, four miles to the S., almost straight up in the direction of Rabba. And if Ṣarfa is at all in the position in which it is placed by Musil—10 kils. (=6 miles) N.W. of Rabba,

[1] See De Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte* (1853), ii. 42 f.

[2] Nu 21[15] 22[36] (if, as is probable, עיר מואב, the 'City of Moab,' is the same as ער מואב), Dt 2[18], show that Ar must have been on or near the upper course of the Arnon, on the E. *border* of Moab (so Dillmann, Gray, G. A. Smith, *E.B.* s.v. AR, etc.). Areopolis (*Rabba*) was in the *centre* of Moab.

[3] De Saulcy, i. 307–312, 314, 317–323, 325, with the map (Planche IX), which should be carefully compared. The description is very minute, the times when each spot was reached being carefully noted, and the relevant distances and directions regularly stated. The route is described in the text above only in the barest outline.

[4] See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. 323; cf. 549.

[5] See G. A. Smith, *Expositor*, July and August 1908.

with more than one intervening wady—it is difficult to understand how it could be at all on the natural route between Rabba and Zoar, at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea.

I do not pretend to be able to explain the discrepancies between De Saulcy and Musil; I shall be satisfied if I have written enough to lead the next commentator on Is 15 to pause before he identifies Ṣarfa with Luḥith. Buhl, writing in 1896 (the date of his *Geographie*), was justified, on the strength of De Saulcy's statements, in accepting Ṣarfa as a *possible* site for Luḥith (notice his 'perhaps'); but whether it can still be maintained, in face of the positions and measurements given by Musil, is the question which will now have to be considered. Musil himself (p. 75) remarks that Râs el-Fâs, or el-Râs (*ibid.* p. 72), 2½ miles S.E. of the S.E. corner of the Dead Sea, might, so far as the situation goes, be Luḥith. If the *Onomasticon* is to be trusted, Luḥith will have been on an ascent[1] somewhere on the road between Rabba and the Zoar known to Eusebius. With our present knowledge, it must be obvious, nothing more definite can be said. As the name does not appear to have been preserved, we must, even to fix conjecturally its position, more closely ascertain first what would be the natural route between those two places, and then what are the principal ascents on that route.[2] The northern site, considered above, must, of course, be unconditionally abandoned.[3]

[1] The context in Is. seems to show that we want an ascent that would be climbed by those *leaving* Moab. Conversely, Ḥoronaim (Is 15[5]) would be at the bottom of some declivity (see Jer 48[5]) leading down on the S. or S.W. from the high Moabite plateau. Cf. Mesha's inscription, l. 32, where Chemosh says to Mesha, '*Go down*, fight against Ḥoronên.'

[2] Whether the Luḥithǫ mentioned in a Nabatæan inscription from Mêdebah is the Luḥith of Is 15 is uncertain. See Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 248.

[3] If Musil's measurements are correct, both Rabba and W. Beni-Hamid (Ḥammâd) are, in the P.E.F. map and G. A. Smith's map, too far to the N., and the latter on these maps, leading up to Mejdelain, really corresponds to Musil's Seil Minḳa'a (leading up to Mejdelên); and in the map in *D.B.* Rabba is slightly, and Ṣarfa is a good deal, too far to the south. In Musil's map, Rabba is very slightly *south* of the south end of the bay formed by the north projection (ending at Point Costigan) of the promontory el-Lisân; and Ṣarfa is very slightly S. of the latitude of Point Costigan. The map in *E.B.* (*s.v.* MOAB) rightly omits Luḥith altogether.

(*To be continued.*)

In the Study.

Gospel.

IN his *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (2nd ed. 1884), Skeat derives the English word 'gospel' from the Anglo-Saxon *gód*, 'God,' and *spell*, 'a story,' 'history,' 'narrative.' Thus the literal sense, he says, is the 'narrative of God,' that is, the life of Christ. Then, he says, 'It is constantly derived from A.S. *gód*, 'good,' and *spell*, 'story,' as though *gód spell* were a translation of Gk. εὐαγγέλιον.' But Skeat himself proceeds to show that in the *Ormulum* (Introd. 157), written when Anglo-Saxon was not yet forgotten, the word is used in the sense of the Gk. εὐαγγέλιον, 'good news.' The words are '*Goddspell* onn Ennglissh nemmnedd iss god word and god tithennde,' *i.e.* 'Gospel is named in English good word and good tiding.' Marsh had already pointed this out, and had quoted another example from the *Ormulum* (Introd. 175) and one from Layamon (iii. 182). The example from Layamon is, *And beode ther godes godd-spel*, i.e. 'and preach there God's gospel,' a phrase, says Marsh, not likely to be employed if 'gospel' had been understood to mean of itself 'God's story,' or the life of Christ. On the other hand, Marsh points out that in Continental Old Saxon 'gospel' undoubtedly meant the life of Christ, and only the life of Christ (see *Student's English Language*, 2nd ed. 1863, p. 26).

Murray has settled the question.[1] The word, he says, doubtless originally was *gód spel*, that is, 'good tidings,' being a rendering of the Lat. *bona adnuntiatio*, which was current as an explanation of Lat. *evangelium*, Gk. εὐαγγέλιον. But when the word passed into the languages of the Teutonic peoples evangelized from England, it was adopted as the translation of *evangelium*, which at the time meant chiefly one of the first four books of the New Testament, or a portion of the liturgy.

[1] In his new edition (1910) Skeat agrees.

We must therefore take the word as originally meaning 'good news,' like the Lat. *evangelium* and the Gk. εὐαγγέλιον. And when Emerson (*Brief History of the English Language*) compares *gospel*, 'God's story,' with *gossip*, i.e. *god sib*, 'related to God,' 'sponsor,' and with *goodbye*, 'God be wi' ye,' he is taking gospel in its secondary meaning. This secondary meaning probably arose from contracting the title 'the Gospel according to St. Matthew' into 'the Gospel of St. Matthew.'

But the Greek and Latin words were both used in the secondary sense. Trench says that the earliest occurrence of the Greek word as applied to the four inspired records of the ministry of our Lord is in Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 66). Yet how easily the one meaning could slip into the other is seen in *Peres the Ploughman* (343):

'Lere me to som man my crede for to lerne,
That lyveth in lel lyf and loveth no synne,
And glosseth nought the godspell';

or in Shakespeare (*Twelfth Night*, v. i. 295):

'A madman's epistles are no gospels.'

Becon says: 'The Greek word *evangelion*, which we call *gospel* in English, soundeth in our common tongue a good, joyful, and merry message' (*Works*, p. 113, Parker Soc.). But Becon's contemporary, Thomas Elyot, says: 'Nowe be we commen to the newe testament, and principally the bokes of the Euangelistes, vulgarely called the gospelles' (*The Governour*, ii. 391); for both meanings have been in use throughout the history of the word.

Besides being translated into the purely English word 'gospel,' the Lat. *evangelium* was itself taken into English (through the French) in the form 'evangel.' The oldest example in Murray is from Hampole's *Psalter*, about 1340. Murray says that in England the word was, in the seventeenth century, already archaic and purely literary, but in Scotland remained in current use as a synonym for 'gospel' until a still later period. In addition to the examples in the *Oxford Dictionary*, and perhaps better than any of them, take this from Taverner's *Postils*, of date 1540 (Oxford ed. p. 248): 'The euangell or glad tydynges of oure saluation (whyche thynge we call commonly in Englyshe a gospell).'

Evangel has the advantage of being easily turned into a verb, 'evangelize,' and a personal subst. 'evangelist.' But 'gospel' itself could once be used as a verb, and there was a subst. 'gospeller.' Sir John Cheke in Mt 11^5 has simply 'gospeld' for A.V., 'have the gospel preached to them'—'ye deed be raised, and ye beggars be gospeld.' 'Gospeller' was used for a preacher of the gospel, as well as for one of the four Evangelists. Wyclif's translation in Is 41^{27} is 'to Jerusalem an evangelist I shal gyue,' which in Purvey's version becomes 'y schal gyue a gospellere to Jerusalem'; while in the preface to Matthew's Gospel, Wyclif says: 'Matheu that was of Judee, as he is set first in ordre of the gospelleris, so he wroot first the gospel in Judee.' In the old rubrics the gospeller is the reader of the gospel in the Communion Office.

In one of his sermons Thomas Adams tells this story (*Works*, i. 33). What does 'gospel' mean in it? 'A boy was molested with a dog; the friar taught him to say a gospel by heart, and warranted this to allay the dog's fury. The mastiff spying the boy, flies at him; he begins, as it were, to conjure him with his gospel. The dog, not capable of religion, approacheth more violently. A neighbour passing by bids the boy take up a stone; he did so, and throwing at the dog, escaped. The friar demands of the lad how he sped with his charm. "Sir," quoth he, "your gospel was good, but a stone with the gospel did the deed." The curs of Antichrist are not afraid of our gospel, but of our stones: let us fight, and they will fly.'

Not Ashamed.

I.

God not Ashamed.

He 11^{16}, 'God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God.'

He was called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and we are told that He was not ashamed to be called their God. When He appeared to Moses in Midian, He introduced Himself in this way—'I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' And when He sent him down into Egypt, 'Thus,' He told him, 'shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you.'

Why was He not ashamed to be called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob? Because

they walked by faith, and not by sight. He is never called the God of Lot, the God of Ishmael, the God of Esau. He would have been ashamed to be called their God. For they walked by sight, and not by faith. Lot lifted up his eyes and saw all the Plain of Jordan that it was well watered everywhere, chose that, and settled there. And when Chedorlaomer and his allies harried the land, there was nothing left of all that Lot set his heart upon. Abraham became rich also. But he did not give his whole soul to the heaping up of wealth. When disappointed in one expectation, he found refuge in some more spiritual promise. When at last he discovered that the land of promise was not to be his, he looked for a City which had foundations, whose builder and maker was God. Esau had a choice between the birthright and the pottage. He chose the pottage. A bird in the hand, he would say, is worth two in the bush.

Two reasons are given why God was not ashamed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to be called their God. The first is that they looked for a City; the second, that He prepared for them a City. He would have been ashamed of them, if they had not looked for a City: He would have been ashamed of Himself, if He had not had a city prepared for them. He was not ashamed to be called their God, because to that spiritual Deep in them there was a corresponding spiritual Deep in Himself.

'Deep calls to deep':—man's depth would be despair
But for God's deeper depth: we sow to reap.
Have patience, wait, betake ourselves to prayer:
Deep answereth deep.

II.

Christ not Ashamed.

He 2^{11}, 'He is not ashamed to call them brethren.'

If God is not ashamed to be called their God, Christ will not be ashamed to call them brethren. We should expect that. For they are the same persons. They are those who walk by faith, and not by sight, the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of all time. He is not ashamed. 'Behold my mother and my brethren,' He said; 'for whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.'

Still it is a further revelation. For we are told that God is bringing many sons to glory, and for that end has provided a Captain of their salvation. He is no longer waiting, if we may say so, to receive them when they come. He has provided a passport, and furnished them with a guide.

And it is a further revelation in another way. For now we see the kind of City which God has prepared for them. It is a home. It is a family hearth. He is not only their God, but their Father. And the Son of His love is not ashamed to call them brethren.

But there are three reasons given why Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren. The first reason is that He and they are of one God and Father. There is a certain distinction yet, it is true. He teaches them to say 'Our Father'; but He does not yet say 'Our Father' with them. He says 'My Father and your Father.' For they have not reached home yet. They do not yet know the might of the power of the Father's love. It is His will—'Father, I will,' He says, 'that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory—for thou lovedst me from the foundation of the world.' When they understand the glory of a love like that and respond to it, then perhaps He will be able to say 'Our Father' with them. But meanwhile He is not ashamed to call them brethren, because He can say 'My Father and your Father.'

The next reason is that He and they have the same experience in life. He is made like unto His brethren in this. He is tempted in all points like as they are. He takes up His cross, saying, 'Not my will, but thine be done.' They take up their cross and follow Him. They are even crucified with Him. And being crucified with Him, they rise with Him into a new life. There is nothing that makes good fellows like misfortune. The experience of life for Him and for them is a series of disappointments. If they were rich and He poor, He might be ashamed to call them brethren. But they wear the garb of the mendicant together. For He who was rich, for their sakes became poor, and He is not ashamed to call them brethren.

The third reason is that they reach the same home at last. Dale tells us in his *Life* that he never dared to call Jesus brother until he lost his own only brother. When his brother reached

the Home, he dared to call the other 'Brother.' 'I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there ye may be also.' Both at home. In the Father's House. He has willed it, and He has won it, and He is not ashamed to call them brethren.

III.

Paul not Ashamed.

Ro 1[16], 'I am not ashamed of the gospel.'

It is rather amusing to hear the Apostle say this. It is almost as if he had said, I am not ashamed of Christ. It is almost as if he had said, I am not ashamed of God. Still it is not quite the same. For what is the gospel? It is not simply the bringing of many sons to glory; it is the effort to persuade men to become sons. It is not the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of this world walking majestically by faith and being received into the prepared City. It is the despised and the degraded, the earthly, the sensual, the devilish; it is the Lots, the Ishmaels, the Esaus of this world under earnest appeal to abandon their earthliness, and seek those things which are above. Now in Paul's day any appeal to these was looked upon with suspicion or contempt. The bottom dog was left at the bottom. 'This people that knoweth not the law is cursed.' If Paul had been visiting those cities where the Jews had planted themselves to encourage their Abrahams, their Isaacs, and Jacobs to walk by faith, and not by sight, he would have been well received. But he brings a crucified Messiah for the salvation of the outcast. And when we see the situation, we see that there is less room for laughter than for tears.

He gives three reasons for not being ashamed. First, the gospel is the power of God. Now, as he says elsewhere, even the weakness of God is stronger than men. How much stronger, then, must His power be. We are not ashamed of power. It is of weakness that we are ashamed. If Paul can prove that the gospel is really the power of God, he has certainly no reason to be ashamed of it.

The second reason is that it is the power of God unto salvation. This is not so evident a reason for not being ashamed of the gospel. For salvation is not so universally admired as power is. His countrymen had very clear ideas about salvation. There were just two classes of people in the world—the righteous and the sinners. The righteous were saved already, by the keeping of the law. They did not need salvation. The sinners needed it very much, but they did not deserve it, and they would never get it. Paul said he was not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, because it was the power of God unto salvation. Salvation for whom? they asked. Then he gave his third reason.

The third reason is that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. And that there might be no mistake he added, 'To the Jew first, and also to the Greek.' He meant to say that there is no Jew that does not need it, and no Greek. He meant to say that there is no Jew that may not have it, and no Greek. He may well say, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.'

It is a further revelation. We have seen Abraham on the way to the City which hath foundations, and God is not ashamed to be called his God. We have seen God bringing many sons to glory, and for that end making the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. And the Captain is not ashamed to call the rank and file His brethren. But now we hear of a gospel for the waif and the stray, a gospel that goes into the byways to find the abandoned and the abominable, a gospel with a power of appeal that is called compelling them to come in. It is not that Lydia is to be neglected; it is that the keeper of the prison in the same city is to be remembered.

IV.

Little Children not Ashamed.

1 Jn 2[28], 'And now, my little children, abide in him; that if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.'

Who are these 'little children'? They are not those who always kept the commandments and did not need salvation. They are those who needed it, who did not deserve it, and were supposed never to find it. They were once 'far off'; now they are 'made nigh.' From being sinners of the Jews, from being aliens of the Greeks, they have become 'little children.' The gospel has been to them the power of God unto salvation.

And now what wait they for? Simply for His manifestation. They wait for the triumphal entrance into the City. And although God is not

ashamed to be called their God; although Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren; although by the power of God they are now enjoying salvation: still their salvation is not yet complete, there is the possibility that even yet they may be ashamed at His coming.

For in all the intercourse of God with man, He uses no compulsion except the compulsion of love. If one who has tasted and seen that the Lord is gracious feels constraint, it is the love of Christ that constrains him. And he must will to abide within the constraint of that love. He must, in the Apostle's words, 'abide in him,' in close conscious contact, that he may not be ashamed at His coming, but may have an abundant entrance into His eternal kingdom and glory.

Two Old Testament Commentaries.[1]

By the Rev. J. A. Selbie, D.D., Aberdeen.

1. Exact scholarship, a scientific temper of mind, and the reverence of a believer in Divine revelation combine to render Principal Skinner an ideal commentator on the Book of Genesis. The work before us will unquestionably take its place in the very front rank of modern O.T. commentaries. We can award it no higher praise than to say that it need not shrink from comparison with what has hitherto been *facile princeps* in the series to which it belongs—Driver's *Deuteronomy*. Before proceeding to deal with other features of this great work, we may note two respects in which even our acquaintance with Dr. Skinner had hardly prepared us to expect him to reach such excellence—namely, the literary style, which is not only clear and lucid but frequently reaches true eloquence; and the consummate skill and unfailing courtesy with which he treats opponents. We confess we had looked for a little more of that 'impatience with stupid people' which used to be attributed to the late Professor Robertson Smith. But Dr. Skinner's is no doubt the more excellent way. Not, indeed, that he cannot, when necessary, give play to a mild sarcasm. What, for instance, could be more charming than this touch?: 'What with Winckler and Jeremias, and Cheyne, and now Eerdmans, O.T. scholars have a good many "new eras" dawning on them just now. Whether any of them will shine unto the perfect day, time will show' (p. xliii).

Hitherto the best commentaries on *Genesis* at the disposal of the English-speaking student have been the translation of Dillmann's great work (T. & T. Clark, 1897), and the admirable *Westminster Commentary* of Driver. Our debt to Dillmann we should find it hard to estimate, but a considerable change has passed on the situation since his day; while Dr. Driver would be the first to admit that the 'Westminster' series denied him that scope of which Dr. Skinner has been able to avail himself in the 'International Critical' series. As for recent German commentaries, with all their excellence, we confess to have missed precisely what we find in the pages of Dr. Skinner's work. Take even the great work of Gunkel. In spite of its brilliance and suggestiveness, is there not a good deal of the wildly erratic in its theories and combinations, and is not an uneasy suspicion at times awakened in the mind of the cautious student that the ingenious author of *Schöpfung und Chaos* has discovered a mare's nest?

Most readers will be heartily glad that Dr. Skinner passes over so lightly the controversies as to the compatibility of the earlier chapters of Genesis with the conclusions of modern science. All such questions will soon cease, if they have not already ceased, to possess any living interest. Far more importance attaches to the question of the historical or legendary character of the book, or the relation of one of these elements to the other. Here Dr. Skinner is seen at his best, and we shall be sorely disappointed if his carefully weighed words fail to reassure some timid souls. For instance, in contrasting history with legend,

[1] The International Critical Commentary.—1. *Genesis*, by Principal Skinner, D.D., Westminster College, Cambridge, 1910. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; price 12s. 6d. 2. *Chronicles*, by Professor E. L. Curtis, D.D., Yale, with the assistance of Rev. A. A. Madsen, Ph.D., Newburgh, N.Y.; price 12s.

and defining the true character of the latter, he says:

'While legend is not history, it has in some respects a value greater than history. For it reveals the soul of a people, its instinctive selection of the types of character which represent its moral aspirations, its conception of its own place and mission in the world; and also, to some indeterminate extent, the impact on its inner life of the momentous historic experiences in which it first woke up to the consciousness of a national existence and destiny' (p. iv).

Dr. Skinner finds no difficulty in proving that in this sense much of the material contained in the early chapters of Genesis represents legend and not history, while at the same time it is possible, he argues, by the exercise of due care to extract solid historical results from a tradition that is mainly legendary. As to the presence of myths in Genesis, our author accepts as correct 'for all practical purposes' the view that the Hebrew mind did not produce myths of its own, but borrowed and adapted those of other peoples. This point is illustrated in detail (p. viii ff.).

A question of fundamental interest and importance to many readers will be that of the historical background of the *patriarchal traditions*. Nothing could surpass in fairness Dr. Skinner's treatment of the claims that have been put forward by recent apologists on archæological grounds. He shows exactly what archæology has proved and what it has left as much open to question as before. As to the *personalities* of the patriarchs, he examines carefully the theories that they were originally personified tribes, or that they were originally Canaanite deities. The cases of Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph are doubtful, although even here the *possibility* of an individual as opposed to a tribal origin of the names is not excluded; but Abraham has a claim to individuality that is all his own. On this point Dr. Skinner expresses so well the present writer's own conviction on the subject that it will be best to quote his words:

'An important element in the case is the clearly conceived type of *character* which he (Abraham) represents. No doubt the character has been idealized in accordance with the conceptions of a later age; but the impression remains that there must have been something in the actual Abraham which gave a direction to the idealization. It is this perception more than anything else which invests the figure of Abraham with the significance which it has possessed for devout minds in all ages, and which still resists the attempt to dissolve him into a creation of religious phantasy. If there be any truth in the description of legend as a form of narrative conserving the impression of a great personality on his age, we may venture, in spite of the lack of decisive evidence, to regard him as a historic personage, however dim the surroundings of his life may be' (p. xxv).

And again (p. xxvii): 'The appearance of a prophetic personality such as Abraham is represented to have been, is a phenomenon with many analogies in the history of religion. The ethical and spiritual idea of God which is at the foundation of the religion of Israel could only enter the world through a personal organ of Divine revelation; and nothing forbids us to see in Abraham the first of that long series of prophets through whom God has communicated to mankind a saving knowledge of Himself. The keynote of Abraham's piety is *faith* in the unseen,—faith in the Divine impulse which drove him forth to a land which he was never to possess; and faith in the future of the religion which he thus founded. He moves before us on the page of Scripture as the man through whom faith, the living principle of true religion, first became a force in human affairs. It is difficult to think that so powerful a conception has grown out of nothing. As we read the story, we may well trust the instinct which tells us that here we are face to face with a decisive act of the living God in history, and an act whose essential significance was never lost in Israelite tradition.'

On the preservation and collection of the traditions and the structure and composition of the Book of Genesis, Dr. Skinner succeeds in formulating what is one of the most convincing arguments we have ever read in favour of the prevailing critical view. He appears to us to be especially successful in combating the objections of Dr. Orr (who, by the way, ought to have conceded nothing to his opponents if he was to escape finally conceding a great deal more), and the recent insidious attempts to invalidate the argument drawn from the varying use of the Divine names.

It may be of interest to note, finally, Dr. Skinner's view as to the date of the final redaction, when P^g was amalgamated with JE (p. lxvi).

'If the lawbook read by Ezra before the congregation as the basis of the covenant (Neh $8^{1ff.}$) was the entire Pentateuch (excepting late additions),[1] the redaction must have been effected before 444 B.C., and in all probability the redactor was Ezra himself. On the other hand, if (as seems to the present writer more probable) Ezra's lawbook was only the Priestly Code, or part of it ($P^g + P^h$),[2] then the final redaction is brought down to a later period, the *terminus ad quem* being the borrowing of the Jewish Pentateuch by the Samaritan community. That event is usually assigned, though on somewhat precarious grounds, to Nehemiah's second term of office in Judæa (*c.* 432 B.C.).

[1] So Wellhausen, Dillmann, Kittel, *et alii*.

[2] So Cornill, Holzinger, *et alii*.

On the sphere of the commentary proper (which extends to 540 pages) we cannot enter. It may suffice to say that nothing is wanting for which the Old Testament student is entitled to look. He will find not only textual and literary criticism at the very highest level, archæology and comparative religion made to yield their latest and best results, exegesis of the safest and soundest type, but also a depth of spiritual insight which gives to this commentary quite a unique value. We should like to call attention, further, to the extremely important 'Extended Notes,' pre-eminent amongst which we have noted those on 'The Heb. and Bab. Sabbath,' 'The Chronology of Gn 5,' 'The Babel Legend,' 'Historical Value of Gn 14,' 'The Sacrifice of Isaac,' 'The "Shiloh" prophecy of Gn 49^{10},' 'The Zodiacal Theory of the Twelve Tribes.'

2. The pages of Professor Curtis's commentary introduce us to a very different class of religious literature. The Books of Chronicles are not specially popular with the ordinary reader of the Bible, and their real significance has not always been correctly appraised even by scholars. Dr. Curtis's difficulties in executing his task have been seriously increased by illness and partial loss of eyesight—a circumstance which necessitated the calling in of a coadjutor in the person of Dr. A. A. Madsen, whose work is fully recognized in the Preface. The Introduction contains a careful examination of the relation of Chronicles to Ezra-Nehemiah, and a discussion of the date of the work, which 'may be confidently given' as about 300 B.C. (p. 6). Proceeding to deal with the plan, purpose, and historical value, Dr. Curtis shows that the author of Chronicles belongs to the same school as the Priests' Code, delighting, equally with the latter, in all that pertains to the ministry of the sanctuary, showing the same fondness for registers and statistics, and indulging at times in similar exaggerations. The author's dominating motive is well defined as follows:

'He interpreted Israel's life, after the pattern of the Priests' Code of its national beginning under Moses, as that of a church with constant rewards and punishments through signal Divine intervention . . . . He made more universal the connection between piety and prosperity, and wickedness and adversity, heightening good and bad characters and their rewards and punishments, or creating them according to the exigencies of the occasion' (p. 9).

The method of procedure is illustrated in detail by the Chronicler's treatment of the history of the various kings, as contrasted with the account given in the Books of Kings.

Owing to this deliberate reconstruction of the history, the Books of Chronicles are shown to be a 'tendency' composition possessing but little historical value.

'The picture which they give of the past is far less accurate or trustworthy than that of the earlier Biblical writings; indeed, it is a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of post-exilic Judaism; and the main historical value of these books consists in their reflection of the notions of that period. Yet at the same time some ancient facts, having trickled down through oral or written tradition, are doubtless preserved in the amplifications and embellishments of the Chronicler. . . . These are few, indeed, compared with the products of the imagination, and must be sifted like kernels of wheat from a mass of chaff' (p. 14 f.).

We are thoroughly at one with Dr. Curtis's appreciation of the Chronicler as a historian. It is important to bear in mind that none of the Old Testament writers—and least of all those of the Priestly school—wrote history *for its own sake.* Their aim was spiritual edification; they viewed themselves as interpreters of Divine providence; they gave rather a philosophy of history than history itself. Keeping this in view, and the pædagogic purpose served by the Law and its literary allies, we can conceive how the religious value of the Books of Chronicles may far surpass their religious value.

'The religious value of Chronicles lies in the emphasis given to the institutional forms of religion. Forms, ceremonies, institutions of one sort or another are necessary for the maintenance of religious life. The Chronicler, it is true, over-emphasized their importance, and his teachings are vitiated by a false doctrine of Divine interference without human endeavour, and a false notion of righteousness consisting largely in the observance of legal forms and ceremonies. Yet in his own time, unless he had been a direct forerunner of Christ, he could not have been expected to give a different message, and in his day his message rendered a most important service. He belonged not only to the same school of writers as the author or authors of the Priestly element of the Pentateuch, but was kindred with the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and especially Malachi . . . . Through these writings the past also was idealized and glorified as a norm for present activity and future development. Nothing better than the authority of the past could have served in those days to intensify the loyalty and devotion of the ancient Jew. The Divine law of retribution and special providence, which the Chronicler taught, was a most powerful factor also for preserving the Jewish Church. It must also never be forgotten that it was under the tutelage of men like the Chronicler that the Maccabees were nourished, and that the heroic age of Judaism was inaugurated' (p. 16 f.).

Further sections in the Introduction deal very satisfactorily with such subjects as the sources (canonical and un-canonical) at the disposal of the Chronicler, the peculiarities of his diction, and the Hebrew text and the versions. An interesting account is given of what criticism has had to say on the Books of Chronicles, and a very valuable list of the Literature dealing with them is appended.

The commentary proper (473 pp.) deserves unstinted praise, and will be found of extreme value by all who are interested in this late constituent of the Canon, which possesses so much interest alike from the literary and the religious standpoint. Dr. Curtis has supplied the English-speaking student of the Old Testament with precisely the work he required.

Another View of Professor Hilprecht's Fragment of a Deluge Tablet.

By George A. Barton, A.M., Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College, U.S.A.

The treatment accorded this fragment of a Deluge tablet by two such distinguished scholars as Dr. Pinches and Professor Hommel in The Expository Times for May is very suggestive. As my own attention has, in consequence of previous studies, been attracted to points which seem, in part at least, to have escaped the notice of the scholars mentioned, a few words from a different point of view may not be out of place.

It should be noticed, in the first place, that the tablet is a mere fragment. No line of it is complete. Every one who interprets any line must resort in some degree to conjecture. A full discussion of Professor Hilprecht's conjectures will appear in an article soon to be published in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. I will here content myself with a few observations on line 12. There are visible but four signs in this line, namely, ku um mi ni. Hilprecht divides them ku-um mi-ni, translates them 'instead of a number,' supplies before this, 'and the creeping things two of everything,' making the whole read: 'and the creeping things two of everything instead of a number.' It is my belief that this whole procedure is untenable.

If we turn to Haupt's *Nimrodepos*, p. 138, lines 85, 86, we find that three classes of living beings went into the Babylonian ark. 'Cattle of the field, beasts of the field,' formed one class. Hilprecht's tablet gives this as 'beasts of the field and birds of heaven,' which forms a more beautiful line, and avoids tautology. Another class was the family (*kimta*) of the Babylonian hero. This appears in the last line of Hilprecht's tablet as *kin-ta*. The third class was 'artisans' (*ummâni*). This third class we also find in l. 12 of Hilprecht's tablet if we join the last three syllables which appear there, *um-mi-ni*, and regard ummîni as a variant form of *ummâni*, just as we have *kurummîti* for *kurummâti* and *shurmînu* for *shurmânu*. The remaining syllable *ku* would then belong to the end of some lost word. That word may have been *li-il-li-ku*, since this word occurs in a similar connexion on the deluge fragment discovered by Père Scheil (cf. *Recueil de Travaux*, xx. p. 58, l. 20). The line would then mean 'let the artisans come.' It is surely a more scientific method of investigation to go to other accounts of the Deluge for suggestions as to how to read the signs and to fill out the lacuna than to assume that the signs which have survived introduce something new, and then to fill them out from the Old Testament.

If we adopt the reading suggested above, all claims that this fragment bears a unique witness to the text of the P document fall to the ground. The cuneiform does not even contain the word 'number' (*minu*), so that there is no occasion to discuss its relation to the word מִן. Delitzsch perceived in 1886 that מִן could not be 'number' in the Biblical passages, and withdrew this rash suggestion of his youth (cf. *Prolegomena*, p. 143), which Hilprecht has more rashly revived.

It is clear from the above remarks that the tablet has no significance for the Biblical student

over any other fragment of the Babylonian account of the Deluge. I also believe that it has no especial claim to notice on account of its superior antiquity. Professor Hilprecht dates it in the time of the dynasty of Isin between 2190–2000 B.C. His reasons are: (1) the stratum in which it was found; (2) the palæography of the tablet; (3) the philology of its text. A dispassionate examination of these three classes of evidence shows that no one of them will bear out the inference put upon it.'

1. Hilprecht says on page 1 of this Deluge publication (i.e. *Bab. Exp. of the University of Pennsylvania*, ser. D, vol. v. Faciculus 1.), that the tablet was found 'while unpacking and examining two boxes of cuneiform tablets from our fourth expedition to Nippur.' On page 36 of the same publication he says: 'It was found intermingled with the dated and undated tablets of the lowest of the three strata of "Tablet Hill."'

Now the tablet was clearly found before Hilprecht himself reached Nippur, for he had not seen it until October of the present year. Indeed, in a footnote on page 1 he excuses himself for having overlooked it in Constantinople in 1901. But the important point is, that in *B.E.*, ser. D, vol. i. p. 509, Professor Hilprecht has himself said some interesting things about the methods of work followed by the fourth expedition before his arrival. He says: 'Our knowledge as to how and precisely where the tablets were found is extremely limited. As I must depend exclusively on Haynes's official entries and records for this important question, I deem it necessary to submit a specimen of my only written source of information for the time prior to my arrival, when most of the tablets were taken out of the ground. I quote literally from his diary: "January 16, 1900; 30 sound tablets from a low level in Tablet Hill." To this statement Hilprecht adds a footnote which reads: "I cannot even find out in which section of the large mound he unearthed these particular tablets. Nor is the slightest indication given by him as to whether he worked in a room, or found the tablets loose in the earth, or in both."' To continue his quotations of Haynes's diary: 'Many large fine fragments of tablets, one pentagonal prism, $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches long; its five sides from 1–$2\frac{1}{6}$ inches wide.' Three or four other quotations from Dr. Haynes's diary follow, all of the same import. The only definite statement is that the tablets were found at a 'low level' in 'Tablet Hill.' This 'low level' in 'Tablet Hill' is where Dr. Haynes says all his tablets were found.

Again, in the book on the *So-Called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, p. 196, he declares that Dr. Haynes put tablets into boxes as he took them out of the ground, numbering the boxes 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., and that the only way he (Hilprecht) could tell from what part of the mounds they came was that the diaries stated in what part of the mound Haynes was digging at certain dates. Hilprecht adds: 'It would have been useful for me if the marking had been such as would indicate also the height of the stratum and the exact position; but Dr. Haynes could not do it, since he was alone in the field, and Mrs. Haynes never attempted to do it; consequently I must now infer . . . by other means to which stratum the tablets belong.'

If we turn now to p. 132 of the same book, we find that Hilprecht has there published the testimony of Mrs. Haynes, who was present when the so-called library was discovered. Her testimony shows that the general level at which tablets were found was known, but that the tablets were not found in strata at all. They were found, Mrs. Haynes says, in different rooms, dumped in such great heaps in the middle that the men could separate them only with the greatest difficulty, and that these heaps appeared as though the tablets had been thrown from shelves at the sides of the room. Imagine a library of account books thrown into the middle of the room from the shelves. Would there be *strata* in it? If the books had been arranged chronologically on the walls, would they be chronological in the heap on the floor?

It is thoroughly established, therefore, from Hilprecht's previous publications, that no such scientific records were kept on the fourth expedition at Nippur that one can draw any conclusions from them as to the date of a tablet. We are accordingly entirely dependent for the date upon palæographical and philological data.

2. Turning now to the palæographical evidence, it should be noted that Professor Clay has published two volumes of Cassite tablets from Nippur, and Dr. Poebel has published a volume of temple archives from the same place, and several volumes of temple archives from Telloh from the time of the Second Dynasty of Ur have been published. In addition to these, the writer has in his possession the photograph of a tablet, said to be from

Nippur, which is now in the Semitic Museum of Harvard University, dated in the reign of Ellil-bâni, a king of the dynasty of Isin, who ruled just at the period when Hilprecht dates his Deluge tablet. The writer has prepared for publication in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* a comparative table of the signs from these five sources. Of the signs which occur on Hilprecht's Deluge tablet ten undergo no development between the time of the Second Dynasty of Ur and the Neo-Babylonian time, and so may be left out of consideration. Of the remaining twenty-seven signs, twenty-one agree with Cassite forms as distinguished from the forms of the First Dynasty, or of Ellil-bâni, or of the kings of Ur. Four of the remaining signs are the same in the First Dynasty, in Hilprecht's tablet, and in the Cassite tablets. One sign agrees with a First Dynasty form, differing from the Cassite on the one hand, and from Ellil-bâni on the other, and one sign differs from the Cassite, agreeing with First Dynasty forms and the form on Ellil-bâni's tablet.

The verdict of palæography is, accordingly, 25 to 2 in favour of a Cassite date. It is 21 to 6 against a date as early as the First Dynasty of Babylon, and it renders the consideration of any earlier date unthinkable.

When we remember, too, that the above comparison is based on temple archives, and that such archives are always in the third millennium written in a less archaic script than the literary tablets of the time, the verdict of palæography is overwhelmingly in favour of a Cassite date for the Deluge fragment.

3. As philological evidence of a date prior to 2000 B.C., Hilprecht claims the use of *m* as a mimmation, the use of PI as *wa*, and the representation of *sh*, when occurring after a dental, by *z*. With reference to the mimmation, it occurs only in the two words *ṣirim* and *napishtim*. As these words were still written in this form in the time of Assurbanipal, the occurrence of the mimmation in the Deluge fragment amounts to nothing.

Hilprecht declares in a recent newspaper article that PI with the value 'wa' is unknown in the Cassite period, and that it does not have the value 'wa' in the name Ni-im-mu-'-wa-ri-ya in the El-Amarna letters.

With reference to PI used as 'wa' three remarks should be made:

(1) PI is used in inscriptions of the First Dynasty (2000–1800 B.C.) both for 'wa' and 'we.' Thus in the laws of Hammurabi we have 'a-PI-tum' for 'a-wa-tum' and 'a-PI-lu-tum' for 'a-we-lu-tum.' The two usages occur side by side. We also find both in the Cassite period (1750–1100 B.C.). Kadashman-Ellil, in the El-Amarna letters, writes the name of Amenophis III. of Egypt 'Ni-mu-'PI-ri-ya' for 'Ni-mu-'wa-ri-ya' and 'Ni-mu-PI-ri-ya' for 'Ni-mu-wa-ri-ya' (see Abel and Winckler, *Thontafelfund von Tell-El-Amarna*, No. 1 : 1; 2 : 1).

In the name 'Ni-mu-wa-ri-ya' the consonant 'w' occurs after the vowel 'u' and before 'a' would certainly be pronounced 'wa.' The letter 'w' slipped in between the vowels 'u,' and 'a' in Semitic to aid the pronunciation (see Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*, S. 49, h.e.).

The fact that the name is Egyptian and not Babylonian is no proof that in the form of it written in Babylonia the ordinary phonetic laws did not apply. The hieroglyphic Egyptian does not express the vowels. 'Ni-im-mu-'-wa-ri-ya' and 'Ni-im-mu-wa-ri-ya' are attempts to represent the Egyptian 'Nb-m'-t-re,' the Egyptian vowels being unknown to us. In the Babylonian form 'b' is assimilated to the following 'm,' 't' is elided and the vowel 'a' follows 'u.' It would be necessary among a Semitic people that between the 'u' and 'a' a 'w' should slip in to help the pronunciation. There is no more ground for doubting that 'PI' was pronounced 'wa' in this word because there was no 'w' in the Egyptian form of the word, than there is for supposing that 'ya' at the end of the word was not pronounced 'ya' because the Egyptian does not contain either letter of that syllable.[1]

In *Babylonian Expedition*, xiv. No. 58, 1 (a tablet of the Cassite period), we also find a-PI-lu-tum for a-we-lu-tum. The same usages are also found in copies of the Greek period (170–85 B.C.). In Reisner's *Sumerischbabylonisch Hymnen*, No. 55, 69, we have a-PI-tim for a-wa-tim, and in No. 2 rev. 27 a-PI-lu-tu for a-we-lu-tu. It is clear, then, that where we find one usage we find the other.

(2) The evidence just adduced shows that PI = wa

[1] The fact that in the *Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*, No. 1, l. 2, the name is spelled Ni-ib-bu-a-ri-a in no way affects the above argument, as that letter was written in Egypt, and does not reflect the Babylonian pronunciation.

is not a mark even of a First Dynasty date, to say nothing of a date in the time of the Isin dynasty, for it is found in the Cassite period and even in the Greek period, down to the first century B.C.

(3) PI is defined in II. R, 39, No. 2, 14, as 'a,' where it is used in writing the word a-ṣu-u—the very word under discussion in Hilprecht's tablet. In I. R, 52, No. 4, 3, PI-aš-ru stands for a-aš-ru. (Cf. Ball, *P.S.B.A.*, x. 290). Here PI must equal 'a,' for the root begins with 'y.' In the word ti-PI-mat (H. 5298, cf. *A.L.*[3], p. 26, n. 1), PI might stand either for 'wa' or 'a.' In the Neo-Babylonian period it was used at Nippur, from which Hilprecht says his Deluge tablet came, at the beginning of several words. Thus Nebuchadnezzar, *B.E.*, I. No. 85, i. 10, uses PI-ash-rat for a-ash-rat Nabu-na'id, *B.E.*, I. No. 84, i. 6, has PI-shi-ib for a-shi-ib; in i. 15, PI-ash-ru-um for a-ash-ru-um; in ii. 33, PI-ar-ka-at for wa-ar-ka-at or a-ar-ka-at; in ii. 45, PI-ash-ri-im for a-ash-ri-im; and in ii. 52, lu-u-PI-aṣ-ṣi-im for lu-u-wa-aṣ-ṣi-im or lu-u-a-aṣ-ṣi-im. It is not certain that any of these were pronounced 'wa,' but when the sign was part of a root beginning with 'w' it may still have had the value 'wa.' That, however, we cannot confidently affirm, for already in the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon we find wa-ar-ḫu-um, 'month' (King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, No. 14, 5), by the side of arḫu (No. 27, 10); cf. also *Laws of Hammurabi*, xxxix. 11, 15, and xliii. 52, and Brockelmann's *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitschen Sprachen*, § 49, h.α. Apparently initial 'w' had begun to disappear in First Dynasty period. There is some uncertainty about the matter, as the word which scholars transliterate 'arḫu' is written ideographically, but that it should be transliterated without the initial 'w' is the opinion of Scheil (*Délégation en Perse*, vol. iv. pp. 114, 127), of R. F. Harper (*Code of Hammurabi*, pp. 92, 106, and 155); L. W. King, *op. cit.* iii. 267, and Brockelmann as cited above.

As a result of observing these facts, we may affirm that the one occurrence of PI = wa in Hilprecht's tablet (occurring in wa-ṣi-e) does not prove that the tablet is earlier than the Cassite period, and that it may be that we should read a-si-e, in which case we have a purely Neo-Babylonian form, which is not a mark even for a Cassite date. It is upon this syllable that Professor Hilprecht relies for one-fourth of his philological proof that the tablet is earlier than 2000 B.C. One point more must be touched upon.

Professor Hilprecht declares that 'sh after dentals or sibilants regularly becomes s (in old Babylonian z). This peculiar change of sh to z is never found in the inscriptions of the Cassite period.' In reply, it may be said that it occurs in the following instances in Cassite texts published in the series edited by Hilprecht himself. In *B.E.*, xv. 149, 38, Belit-shu-nu, which according to rule becomes Belit-su-nu, is written Belit-zu-nu. The same name, having, according to another well-known phonetic law, undergone a further change by losing the t, is written in *B.E.*, xv. 188, iv. 20 (Be)-li-zu-nu. The first part of the name, though broken, is vouched for by No. 195 rev. 26, where it is spelled Beli-su-nu. Again, Ellil-uballit-shu, which by regular rule becomes Ellil-uballit-su, is spelled in *B.E.*, xiv. 33, 9, Ellil-uballit-zu. The change of sh to z is accordingly by no means unknown in the Cassite period.

The result of our discussion is in brief this. We have no archæological information from which a date can be affirmed. The palæography points conclusively to a date in the Cassite period. There is nothing in the philology of the tablet that is inconsistent with this. A scientific investigation of the tablet points conclusively, therefore, to a date in the Cassite period. Père Scheil's fragment, dated in the reign of a First Dynasty king, is accordingly some centuries older.

Literature.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF OUR LORD.

The Rev. J. C. V. Durell, B.D., formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, recently published a volume entitled *The Historic Church*, which enabled men to recognize a new writer of promise. He has now published a volume with the title of *The Self-Revelation of our Lord* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net). Its subject is the deepest and most difficult that any man could undertake to write upon. But along with the gift of style Mr. Durell has evidently the gift of insight. He is also most refreshingly honest. This new book will give him a place among the most acceptable writers on religion of the day.

We say Mr. Durell is honest. The problems that present themselves to a writer on our Lord's revelation of Himself include all the ordinary problems of the Gospels, together with many special problems of both theology and psychology. The temptation to a believer is to spend ingenuity in harmonizing instead of giving his strength to history. Mr. Durell has not done this. In dealing with the narrative of the conversation of Jesus with the woman of Samaria, he comes to the very difficult circumstance that so early in the ministry Jesus is represented by St. John as directly declaring Himself to be the Messiah. This declaration, Mr. Durell admits, 'runs counter to all that we have learnt from the Synoptic narrative.' He points out that the Synoptic narrative is concerned for the most part with the ministry in Galilee, 'and it is just possible that considerations which would be of force among a Galilæan or Judæan audience would not have the same force in Samaria.' At the same time he finds it difficult to suppose that Jesus would have departed so far from His constant policy at this early period of His ministry even in Samaria, as to declare Himself openly to be the Christ. The simplest explanation, he thinks, is that St. John, who was presumably not present at the interview, has reconstructed the incident from information with which Jesus may have supplied him, and that he has by this means given a literary shape to the conversation with the woman.

Such a theory will be distasteful to some of us. But it is better to be so disturbed than to be flattered by arguments which try to prove that there is no difficulty in the narrative. And it must be said that Mr. Durell does very much more to confirm belief in the reliability of the gospel narratives than to disturb it. His method is historical. He traces our Lord's revelation of Himself first from the beginning of the ministry to St. Peter's confession, next from St. Peter's confession to the crucifixion. And this historical method of handling his great theme makes it a most irresistible argument on behalf of the reliability of the sources as well as the truthfulness of the theme itself.

The personality of our Lord is the subject of keenest interest at the present moment. No progress can be made in the study of it without an accurate knowledge of the materials contained in the New Testament. There is no book we have seen which sets forth the New Testament doctrine more candidly or more convincingly than this book.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

The Bampton Lecturer for 1909 was the Rev. Walter Hobhouse, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Birmingham Cathedral, and formerly Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford. His lectures have now been published under the title of *The Church and the World in Idea and in History* (Macmillan; 10s. net). The volume contains, not only the lectures as delivered, but also a series of footnotes, and an important appendix of additional notes, some of which must have cost the author a good deal of research. Perhaps the note on the use of the term 'Erastianism' might be selected as an example.

What is the subject of the Bampton Lectures for 1909? It is the purpose of Christ in relation to the world. Canon Hobhouse holds that our Lord intended to make a distinction between the world and the Church, a distinction the most emphatic, and one that was meant to last. The Church was to be in the world, but not of it. And this distinction held good throughout the first three centuries. It began to be obliterated when Christianity became the religion of the

empire. The Bampton lecturer's desire is to recover that distinction, and to insist upon its being observed in the future.

Now there is only one way of recovering that distinction. Those who have not the mind of Christ must be weeded out of the Church and left with the world. How shall we know whether or not a man has the mind of Christ? Canon Hobhouse says very little about that. And he is right to say very little. For we do know. The serious difficulty is not how to distinguish those who belong to the Kingdom from those who belong to the world, but how to keep those who manifestly belong to the world from entering into connexion with the Church.

Some will say that we have no right to interfere with them. They will refer to the Parable of the Tares. They will quote the words of our Lord, 'Let both grow together until the harvest.' Canon Hobhouse explains the Parable of the Tares. He points out that the 'field' where both are allowed to grow together is not the Church, but the world. He argues earnestly that our right to weed the Church of any tares that may sow themselves in it is the unmistakable precept and example of our Lord.

Nevertheless the difficulty is very great. But there are some things which can be done if we have the courage to do them. In the first place, he says, we must work in the direction of re-union. We must seek to unite all the Christian bodies that are Christian. In the next place, we shall probably have to separate the Church from the State. And then, perhaps, we must give up the idea that the kingdoms of this world are all and altogether to become the Kingdom of our God and of His Christ. These are great tasks, and the last is the hardest of all. But the necessity is great. The Missionary Conference in Edinburgh took place after the publication of Canon Hobhouse's Bampton Lectures, and it must have seemed as if every speaker had read the book and recognized the importance of it. For every speaker emphasized this one thing, that the hindrance to the progress of the gospel was the fact that the Christian nations were not Christian. The great evangelist is the personal example of the Christian missionary, but if the example of the missionary is neutralized by the example of the Christian trader the progress of the gospel is stayed.

There is nothing so puzzling to the rationalist as the interest which men continue to feel in the Atonement. In spite of all his superior impatience, the Atonement is more the subject of study now than ever it was, and more is written upon it than ever was written before. The latest book is a systematic exposition of the doctrine by the Rev. Melville Scott, B.D., Vicar of Castlechurch, Stafford. Its title is simply *The Atonement* (George Allen & Sons; 5s. net). Mr. Scott has no new theory of the Atonement to offer. His book will not mark an epoch, or even start a discussion. But his survey of the subject is a thoroughly competent one. And if he emphasizes, and perhaps over-emphasizes, the ethical side, that will make his book only the more acceptable to the modern mind.

The Rev. John Thomas, M.A., of Liverpool, is undoubtedly one of the greatest preachers of our time. His new volume, *The Dynamic of the Cross* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), is not his greatest volume of sermons. We place before it the volume on the Apocalypse; for he seems to rise to his highest height when he has a continued subject. But it is a great volume. We should just like to know where the doctrine of the Cross will be found expressed with more brevity, simplicity, power, than in the sermon on 'The Sin-bearing Lamb of God.'

Mr. Allenson's 'Sanctuary Booklets' (6d. net) consist of *The Practice of the Presence of God* by Brother Lawrence, *The Dream of Gerontius* by Newman, *Saint Paul* by Myers, and *The Changed Cross*, a collection of poems, by the Hon. Mrs. Hobart Hampden.

But Mr. Allenson has another series of devotion besides this, a series issued in leather at 2s. 6d. net, to which he has just added *The Little Flowers of St. Francis*.

Messrs. George Bell & Sons have published a revised text, with introduction and commentary, of *The Elegies of Theognis* (7s. 6d. net). The editor, Mr. T. Hudson-Williams, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University College of North Wales, is a most accomplished and indefatigable scholar.

The editor of the new volume of the 'Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges' is the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, B.D., Vicar of Guilden

Morden. The book is the *Epistle to the Galatians* (Cambridge Press). The introduction is a long one and well packed. The first question to be asked is: Who were the Galatians according to this editor? After a thorough examination of the evidence, Mr. Lukyn Williams comes to the conclusion that they lived in North Galatia. Then he places the Epistle chronologically between 2 Corinthians and Romans. So this subject is all to be opened up again. But there could not be a fairer critic than this or a more informing commentator.

Messrs. Wells Gardner have published a small volume of sermons by the Bishop of London, entitled *The Mysteries of God* (1s. net).

In issuing a new book by Ella Wheeler Wilcox, her publishers have done a very clever thing in issuing along with it a selection of her poems, making a presentation of the booklet containing them. The new book is entitled *New Thought Common Sense, and What Life Means to Me* (Gay & Hancock; 4s. 6d. net). Its chapters are the High Calling of Fatherhood, Common-Sense Ideas in Marriage, Woman and the Cigarette, Sinning against the Holy Ghost, and the like—or the unlike. But whatever the chapter may be called, it is a chapter worth reading and very pleasant to read. For Ella Wheeler Wilcox is a prose writer as well as a poet. She has the intimate style, which, when not overdone, is the most enjoyable of all. Nevertheless, take for preference one of the poems in the book. For there are poems in the book as well as in the booklet.

I know not where to-morrow's paths may wend,
Nor what the future holds; but this I know:
Whichever way my feet are forced to go,
I shall be given courage to the end.

Though God that awful gift of His may send
We call long life, where headstones in a row
Hide all of happiness, yet be it so:
I shall be given courage to the end.

If dark the deepening shadows be, that blend
With life's pale sunlight when the sun dips low,
Though Joy speeds by and Sorrow's steps are slow,
I shall be given courage to the end.

I do not question what the years portend—
Or good or ill, whatever wind may blow;
It is enough, enough for me to know
I shall be given courage to the end.

Messrs. Watts have added to their 'History of Science' series a *History of Old Testament Criticism*, by Professor Archibald Duff (1s. net). It is a handy book for popular use, and will be more popular because of the portraits it contains.

We envy those who have the privilege of listening to the Rev. A. L. Lilley. We envy those who have the power. For there is never a commonplace thought to go to sleep upon; and sometimes the thought is very subtle. But, again, there is never a thought that is there for the sake of its subtlety. Mr. Lilley is a genuine expositor. It is only that he explains the Scripture for himself. And his loyalty to the Lord is exquisite. That species of originality which pleasantly pats the Master with a long forefinger is far removed from him. Mr. Lilley has published many volumes of sermons, and you ought to know him now. But if you do not know him, take the latest, *The Religion of Life* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net), before the others.

The Rev. W. J. Heaton, B.D., recently wrote a volume on *The English Bible before the Age of Printing*. He has now written a sequel to that volume, calling it *The Bible of the Reformation* (Griffiths; 5s. net). It brings the story of the Bible in English a little beyond the time of Taverner. No doubt there will be a third volume to bring the story down to Kenyon's great article in the single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Mr. T. Sharper Knowlson has been a diligent student of Brand's *Popular Antiquities*. And if his book on *The Origins of Popular Superstitions and Customs* (Werner Laurie; 6s. net) does nothing more than send us to Brand, it will do us a distinct service. But it will do more. For Mr. Knowlson has studied other books besides Brand, and he has himself done some research work in popular antiquities. One thing he has made clear enough—that there is much more meaning in these ancient superstitions than this present prosaic generation dreams of. If we had room we should like to dispute some of his derivations, such as that of the 'kern-baby.' He discards 'churn,' although it is known that the 'churn' or 'kirn' had an important place in the harvest supper. And he takes the word to be a corruption of corn.

Dr. E. Lehmann, Professor of Divinity in the

University of Berlin, has written a manual of Mysticism, which has been translated into English. The title is *Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom* (Luzac; 5s. net). It is just such a manual, covering the whole ground and written by a competent authority, as the numerous would-be students of mysticism will welcome. It is divided into chapters on Primitive Mysticism, Chinese Mysticism, Indian Mysticism, and so on. Each chapter will afterwards have to be studied by itself, and it would have been an advantage for that purpose if Dr. Lehmann had added a bibliography.

How good it must be for a man to spend a year of his life in a hard study of *The Ethics of St. Paul*. We mean the book which bears that name. A study of the ethics as it may be gathered from the Epistles themselves would no doubt always be better. But the Rev. A. B. D. Alexander is so loyal to the Apostle, so thorough in his research, so captivating in the way he commends, not one virtue only but the virtuous life, that the study of such a book as this would remain with one an imperishable possession (Maclehose; 6s. net).

The article on 'Charity and Charities' in what is called the tenth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* was written by Dr. C. S. Loch. The article has now been reprinted, and along with other matter forms a volume published by Messrs. Macmillan under the title of *Charity and Social Life* (6s. net). The additional matter is mainly religious—charity in relation to the growth of religious thought. But there is also a new chapter, and a long one, dealing with some of the questions raised by the report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress. Dr. Loch's experience as a director of the administration of charity is unrivalled, whether in variety or in extent; and although he knows the history of its administration also, we should certainly have preferred that he had given us somewhat less of the history of the past and more of the record of his own personal experience. We are in so great a hurry now to mend our manners in the matter of giving that we grudge the time spent among the Greeks and the Romans. And so, much as we approve in general of the historical study of a subject, we have little hesitation in saying that the new chapter on the Report of the Commission is worth all the rest of the book taken together.

A third edition has been issued of Professor Joseph B. Mayor's *Epistle of St. James* (Macmillan; 14s. net). It is thirteen years since the second edition was published, and in that time there has been much study of Apostolic Christianity, and some important discoveries have been made. The consequence is that Professor Mayor, who misses neither book nor magazine article, has worked over the whole commentary again, and made innumerable alterations. In none of these alterations has he had to confess serious error or fundamental change of view. They are nearly all made in the way of establishment and confirmation. Yet they alter the complexion and to some extent the bulk of the new edition. Thus the note on 'shadow of turning' of 1^{17} (τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα) ended in the second edition with the words: 'Spitta takes τροπή of the sun's invisible return from west to east, and ἀποσκίασμα of the darkness of night.' In the third edition the same note ends: 'I cannot agree with Spitta, who takes τροπή of the sun's invisible return from west to east, and ἀποσκίασμα of the darkness of night. This verse forms the key-note of the Celestial Hierarchy of Dionysius.' The greatest change in the size of the book occurs in the Introduction, which now runs to 290 pages against 260 in the second edition. This is due almost entirely to an enlargement of the chapter on the Brethren of our Lord. Again Professor Mayor has not altered his attitude one whit. He still holds that James was son of Joseph and Mary, and full brother of Jesus. But he strengthens his proof by some new arguments and many new quotations. The literature is brought up to date, and it is so full that we wonder Dr. Mayor has omitted Mr. James Adderley's Commentary and the suggestive book by Dr. C. F. Deems of New York, which goes by the title of *The Gospel of Common Sense*. Among the Dictionaries, however, the single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible* should certainly have been mentioned, with its excellent article on the 'Epistle of James' by Mr. Emmet.

Professor Shailer Mathews is a mediator. He stands between the advanced critic of the Gospels and the disturbed follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. He knows the advanced critic and all his works so well that he is not himself at all disturbed. He is not afraid to reprove him. He is not afraid to laugh at him. And then he has immense sympathy with the uneasy believer. He

reproves him also, but he never laughs at him. He stands between those two, accepting just as much as is worth accepting from the advanced critic, and removing just as much as is not worth retaining from the timorous follower.

His new book is entitled *The Gospel and the Modern Man* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net).

There is nothing unfathomably profound, perhaps, in *Absente Reo* (Macmillan; 5s. net), the new book by the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, but there is abundance that is present-day and practical. The book is a collection of 'open' letters written to a High Churchman, and its range of topic is as wide as the interests of a Churchman are ever likely to be. But whatever the topic, the object of the writer seems to be to get the High Churchman to do something. He thinks he is too conservative, too much addicted to conserving whether the thing is worth conserving or not. He looks at Lazarus out of the windows of Dives, instead of looking at Dives from the side of Lazarus. He is alarmed at those people who are trying to turn the world upside down, when he ought himself to be doing all he can to that very end. 'These people that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.' That, says our author, is the Churchman's pathetic plaint, in his forgetfulness that that was said at first of Christians by pagans, and must be said of Christians as long as there are pagans to say it.

It is of no use for any man to write on prayer who has not discovered that things are wrought by prayer. The Rev. W. Arthur Cornaby of Shanghai has had a larger experience of the power of prayer than the average earnest believer in it. It is solely out of his own experience that he writes the book entitled *Let us Pray* (Marshall Brothers). The instances are unimpeachable, and they are both numerous and striking.

Those square little volumes which form the 'Life of Faith' library, with their curious old-world courtesy of binding, are able to introduce us to a real fireside of love. The new volumes are *God's Adversary and Ours*, by the Rev. L. G. Buchanan, M.A., T.C.D., and *Promise and Prophecy*, by Mr. G. W. West (Marshall Brothers; 1s. net each).

The Captivity and the Pastoral Epistles will be found in one volume in the 'Westminster New Testament' (Melrose; 2s. net). The author of the volume is the Rev. James Strachan, M.A., whose volume entitled *Hebrew Ideals* has made his name known far and wide. We congratulate Dr. Garvie, the general editor of the series. Mr. Strachan's work is at once the finest scholarship, and the ripest fruit of spiritual experience. The originality of it is a steady surprise. There is little room for historical or biographical illustration; but where it is found it is worth its place. Take Ephesians 2^{11}—'*Remember that aforetime*: This, says Mr. Strachan, is not inconsistent with the advice to forget the things which are behind (Phil 3^{13}). If you are thinking of the past complacently, forget it; if humbly and thankfully, cherish the memory (cf. Is 51^{1}). "I often take a dander up and down my unregenerate days," said a Scottish saint.'

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have undertaken the issue of a series of volumes which is to be known by the name of the 'Missionary Series.' The editor is George Smith, C.I.E., LL.D., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., whom some may prefer to think of as the father of Principal George Adam Smith, but who has himself a reputation that is enviable, especially as a writer of books on India and its Missions.

Four volumes of the series have been issued at once. They are these:—

1. *Christ the Desire of Nations*, by the Rev. Edgar William Davis (6s.).

2. *The Victory of the Gospel*, by the Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D. (6s.).

3. *The Call of the New Era*, by the Rev. William Muir, M.A., B.D., B.L. (6s.).

4. *By Temple Shrine and Lotus Pool*, by the Rev. William Robinson (6s.).

Some of these volumes catch our interest before we open them. We are told that out of over a hundred missionary works, two of them were selected for a prize of 100 guineas in open competition. As soon as we open them we are face to face with Dr. George Smith's generous, glowing appreciation. But before we close them, we recognize that the appreciation is not overdone. Evidently the offer of a handsome prize is a good way of discovering talent in some departments of literature. If these volumes were selected as the best out of 'over a hundred,' we are forced to

consider how hard it must have been on the examiners to reject the next four. The men who have written these books have given their lives to the study of the missionary problem, some of them also to the practice of it. They have not taken it up as a good topic for a new book; they have not got up the subject for the sake of winning a prize. They are acquainted with the literature of missions; they are in close sympathetic touch with the life of the missionaries. And the examiners have manifestly made it a test of success that the author should be able to write good English.

Two of the authors, Dr. Lilley and Mr. Muir, are United Free Churchmen; Mr. Davis is an American; Mr. Robinson has sent his manuscript from Salem in the south of India. Mr. Robinson's is the only volume with local colour. But it agrees with the rest in dealing with the fundamental principles of missionary effort rather than with their particular application. Of all the volumes it must be said that their subject is Christ quite as much as the Kingdom of God. Or it is the Kingdom of God in Christ's idea and purpose rather than a description of any particular attempt to realize that purpose.

But there is an order among them. Mr. Davis deals with the promise and its earliest apprehension. Dr. Lilley recognizes its universality and the unfailing victory it gives to faithfulness. Mr. Robinson brings it into contact with the actual conditions of our day. Mr. Muir seeks to prepare us for the miracles which are to be done in the years which lie before us.

The latest of Mr. Murray's primers is *A Primer of Ethics* (1s.). The author is Miss E. E. Constance Jones, Mistress of Girton College, Cambridge. It is a marvellous *multum in parvo*. Every chapter of it could be stretched into a volume, every sentence into a chapter. And yet there is neither haste nor obscurity.

The idea of a 'Children's Missionary Series' was a happy one, and it has been just as happily realized. The new volumes give us the *Children of Arabia*, by Dr. J. C. Young of Aden, and the *Children of Africa*, by Mr. J. B. Baird (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. 6d. net). The story is in each case simply and truthfully told. The coloured illustrations catch the eye and keep it.

We shall not suggest of Dr. Butler of Galashiels that architecture is his forte and preaching his foible. But it is evident from the volume on *Gothic Architecture: Its Christian Origin and Inspiration*, which he has just published (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net), that the study of architecture is with him more than an amusement. He studies it with a purpose. He is a preacher already. He studies architecture to make him more a preacher. It may not be, because of the lack of materials to work upon, that architecture will ever become a popular topic with a Bible Class in Scotland. But if any teacher is gravelled for a subject and comes across this book, we shall be greatly astonished if he does not discover one.

There are books which have no index at all. The commentary on *The Gospel according to Saint Luke*, by the Rev. A. S. Walpole, M.A., has an index, and it is the best part of the volume. The commentary itself is extremely brief, the explanation of a word or phrase here and there throughout the narrative. But if Oxford means seriously to challenge the supremacy of Cambridge in small commentaries, a better way could not have been found than the utmost brevity of commentary and the utmost expansion of index, such as we find here. The index is a small dictionary of the Third Gospel (1s. 6d.).

How difficult it seems to be to pray in print. Mr. Victor Rienaecker has published *A Book of Prayers* (Priory Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is simply another illustration of the difficulty. Thus—'This preparedness can, and does, consist with a comparatively small intellectual endowment. The spiritual plane is different from the intellectual, or physical, though it may, and must, govern and fructify them also. And we ask that Thou would'st go far beyond where our poor limited knowledge goes, or our poor puny power could go, and do what we fain would do when we pray in the spirit of Christ.'

But from the Priory Press there comes another book, a book which may be read without reserve. It is *The Church and the Future*, by the late Father Tyrrell (2s. 6d. net), in a new impression.

It takes a strong man or a confident one to publish a volume now on *The Lord's Prayer*

(Revell; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Charles F. Aked is both. The balanced student of theology is bound to feel that he puts too much weight on the mere revelation of the Fatherhood. The student of literature is bound to feel that he errs in taste when he quotes the most terrible verse from Burns' 'Address to the Deil.' But no one will question the clearness of the thinking or the vigour of its expression.

The Duff Lectures are delivered at the colleges of the United Free Church of Scotland. The lectures for 1910 were delivered by Dr. Robert E. Speer, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Six lectures were delivered at each college, and the same six. The subject of the first was the Missionary Duty and Motives; of the second, the Missionary Aim and Methods; of the third, Missions and the Native Churches; of the fourth, Missions and Politics; of the fifth, Christianity and the Non-Christian Religions; of the sixth, the Relation of Missions to the Unity of the Church and the Unity of the World.

Here, then, is the whole theory of witness-bearing, by a man who has made it his lifelong and most devoted study. And it is set forth with unhesitating assurance. At the recent Conference in Edinburgh there was nothing more remarkable than the utter ignorance, on the part of the speakers, of the art of apologizing. For Dr. Speer was there, and he set the example. It is no longer a question of whether the gospel should be sent to the ends of the earth; the only question now is how best to send it. It is to answer that question that the Duff Lectures were delivered and that this book is published. Its title is *Christianity and the Nations* (Revell; 7s. 6d. net).

Essay writers have nearly always the idea that eternal life can be obtained by keeping the commandments. Or rather—for they are right enough in that—they have the idea that any likely young man can be induced to keep them. We do not grudge Dr. Vance's insistence upon right conduct in that new book which he calls *Tendency* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). We only wish that he and the rest of the numerous religious essayists of our day would put the 'follow me' first. The best of these books are always good for one thing; they furnish us with striking anecdotes and illustrations.

The Hon. Mrs. E. A. Gordon has not gone to the ordinary sources for her quotations in *Treasures of Darkness and Songs of Ascent* (Simpkin; 5s. net). The range is wide enough certainly—from the *Weekly Scotsman* to the *Pyramid of Pepi I.* But just because the range is so wide, the familiar quotations are passed by. Perhaps the most striking thing about the book is the frequency with which the Old and New Testaments are quoted. A text from St. Luke is read with new interest on a page which quotes also Dante, Sakya-Muni, and a Sumerian tablet.

Mgr. Duchesne's *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, has reached a third edition in English (S.P.C.K.; 10s.). It represents the fourth French edition, which was published at Paris in 1908. Or rather, it represents a fifth French edition not yet published. For to this English edition Mgr. Duchesne has added some notes which have not appeared in any French edition yet. The most important of these is an account of the discovery at Monte Cassino, by Dom André Wilmart, of fragments of an uncial manuscript which proves to be the earliest example known of a Gregorian Missal.

It is needless now to say anything by way of commendation of Duchesne's book, or of its translation, beyond what has been said already. It is not only necessary for its subject; it is all that is necessary.

After twelve years, Chancellor Lias's manual on *The Nicene Creed* appears in a second edition (Sonnenschein; 7s. 6d.). The second edition is 'reprinted in the main from the old stereotyped plates.' But there is a new preface, in which Mr. Lias replies to a review which appeared in 'a certain theological Quarterly,' and which tried to show that he was insufficiently equipped for the task which he had undertaken. He shows that he was quite well equipped.

Outline Studies, with Illustrations for Sermons and Addresses (Stock; 2s. 6d. net). This is a volume which has been compiled by the Rev. James Dinwoodie. It will soon be laid on the shelf and gather the thickest coat of dust. For that is the fate of even the best volumes of illustrations. But before suffering that eclipse it will provide the best thing in some men's sermons. For some

of its illustrations are quite new and quite illustrative.

The third series of the Moorhouse Lectures, the series for 1910, was delivered by the Bishop of Ballarat, Dr. Arthur Vincent Green. The subject of the Lectures was 'The Johannine Writings.' But Dr. Green does not use the word Johannine in the title of the book containing them. For he does not believe that any of the writings which usually go by the name of the Apostle John were written by him. He believes that they are the product of a school of writers whose centre of abode was Ephesus, and who probably looked to the Apostle John as their founder. He accordingly calls his book *The Ephesian Canonical Writings* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). The whole book is a plea for suspense of judgment. Here are two characteristic sentences. 'Admitting that the evidence for St. John's direct authorship is better in the case of the Apocalypse than in that of any other writing in the New Testament, we must still exercise some patience of the agnostic position. If any man is persuaded that here at least he has the very sentences of John the Apostle, let his persuasion be tempered by charitable recognition of the many inevitable uncertainties which encompass this much debated question.'

The Life of Christ, Part II., by the Rev. W. M. Rankin, B.D., Glasgow (Publications Office of the U.F. Church of Scotland; price 6d.). Mr. Stevens' excellent primer (Part I.) on the Life of Christ has been followed by one equally admirable from the pen of Mr. Rankin, who has also, we believe, undertaken the third and final instalment of the series. The little work before us, which covers the period of our Lord's ministry extending from the Rejection at Nazareth to the Anointing at Bethany, bears traces of the widest reading and most careful study of the subject. It is written in a clear and interesting style, and the material is skilfully adapted to the various ages of the young people for whom the textbook is intended. The illustrative comments and the literary parallels are well chosen, and the whole work may be confidently recommended, especially for the use of Bible classes. In his Preface the author acknowledges indebtedness to Professor Denney for help in planning the book, and to Dr. Selbie for revision of the proofs.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Aberdeen.

Part V.

VII. Some may object to our view that the Rite in the early Church exercised a strong influence on the historians, and may support their objection by pointing to the variations in the accounts given by those historians. This argument ignores human character. Take any dozen people, however similar in education and previous circumstances they may be, and get them each to give an account of some scene at which they have been all present. You will find that they give twelve different accounts, varying slightly in details and in manner of stating the same detail; yet all twelve will be easily recognizable as accounts of the same scene by eye-witnesses.

We therefore presuppose as our starting-point the strong guiding force exerted on every narrator by the familiar Rite. This we regard as fundamental in the right understanding of the authorities. The Rite must have been by Luke regarded as performed regularly from the earliest time, and as being therefore unquestionably authoritative for the words and the actions of the original incident. All this is perfectly natural. In Ac 2^{42} the Breaking of the Bread[1] is certainly the Sacrament, which already was the symbol and pledge of the unity of the Christian society from the day when

[1] In 2^{46}, 'breaking bread' is an act of ordinary life, which may and probably was accompanied by the rite, but is not mentioned with reference to the rite. In 20^{7} the Christians at Troas assembled for the common meal (which was doubtless accompanied by the Sacrament, though no formal mention is made of this).

it constituted itself as a united body on the first Pentecost. Even in the lifetime of Jesus the act was felt to have some special and peculiar significance (Mk 6^{41} 8^{6}, Mt 14^{19} 14^{36}, Lk 9^{16}, Jn $6^{11.23}$), and He was recognized by His disciples at Emmaus after His death 'in the breaking of the bread' (Lk 24^{35}). Such recognition was obviously not due to one performance of the action; especially as there is clear reason to think that the two at Emmaus were not Apostles.

This act was therefore not connected by the early Church merely with the last occasion on which it was performed by the Saviour before His death. The act was characteristic of Him during His life, and remembered as performed by Him on various occasions at the giving of food by Him to His friends and followers. The most impressive by far of those occasions was that which occurred on the night before He was betrayed; this, however, was only one among many occasions; but it was marked out from the rest by the words of Institution, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

There is no reason to think that the Sacrament was at first preserved as an annual or weekly or monthly celebration. It was performed frequently, and apparently was regarded as being suitable on all occasions when a number of the Brethren were assembled to eat together, or when any incident or occasion occurred of bread being eaten in very impressive circumstances.[1]

It was not a periodic rite, but almost a continuous one, as the expression of the belief in the continuous presence of Christ among them. Perhaps we might gather from the emphasis laid on it in Ac 2^{42}, that it was not performed after Lk 24^{30} (or after the Ascension) until the Brethren became aware at Pentecost of the continued presence of the Saviour with them. The Rite was the expression of the firm belief and knowledge that the Saviour was with them, and that the Bread and Wine were given by Him, and according to the Oriental mind were Himself. To the illogically logical and narrow European mind, which can rarely attain to the mystic perception of the truth, this belief and knowledge is often a cause of dissension on the question, whether the material substances given in the Rite are only the symbols of the Divine presence, or are transformed into new and Divine substance—a barren and foolish dissension, between the champions of two empty theories, neither of which has any reality to the mind that looks at the subject from the right point of view: both are products of Western thought, and both are foreign to the Oriental thought. The Western mind, through its desire to give precision and definite form to the vague and mystic, is always prone to misrepresent and misconceive Oriental thought; and thus falls into the error of materializing the ideal and spiritual.

The Oriental view is best understood by the example of a child, which takes a few stones and says, 'This is a castle, and this is a knight riding to attack it,' and so on. The child does not regard the stones as being mere symbols of the castle and the knight, nor does it regard them as transmuted into the castle and the knight. To the child they are what the child makes them. As the child lives its ideal life, which we call 'play,' these material objects become part of its higher life, and are what the things of that life are. The idea is all-powerful: the material fact is of no consequence. The child is right, and the Oriental is right. The idea is the important thing: the material is nought. The doctrine of transubstantiation sinks from the plane of the spiritual and true to the commonest level of materialistic commonplace. It is wholly unspiritual, and supposes the reality to be in mere matter. The doctrine of symbolism is narrowly logical and wholly unmystical. The Sacrament is purely mystic.

VIII. The fact that the doctrine and principle of the Eucharist already existed in the teaching of Jesus at a much earlier time, and was expressed in His practice, does not necessarily throw any doubt on His formal institutions of the Sacrament on the night before His death. The testimony of Paul (1 Co 10. 11) is quite clear and definite on this point; and it may be regarded as final. There is no difficulty and no inconsistency in the two positions: Jesus taught the doctrine during His life (though, like much of His teaching, it was not understood by the disciples), and gave some marked significance to the act of breaking and distributing the Bread in His daily life; on the last night He enjoined on the Twelve to repeat the act in His memory. Both are true.

[1] Ac 27^{35} is not strictly a case (though Blass regards it as being so), for the assembly was almost entirely of pagans; but probably Luke recognized it as being a Sacrament for Paul and for himself and Aristarchus (assuming that the latter was still with them).

It is not a case where we have to choose between one and the other.

One thing, however, follows inevitably from this previously existing germ of the Eucharist. That which was instituted was not a mere commemoration of the death of the Saviour; it had no analogy or connexion with a death-feast or a sepulchral feast, which was usually an annual one. It was the expression of a truth, of a vital principle, which had been part of the teaching of Jesus long before.

John thought that the earlier teaching of Jesus on this subject was even more important than the formal institution of the ceremony. While he devotes considerable space to recounting the events of the Supper on the Thursday night, he does not allude to the incident of the Bread and Wine. One must infer that he regarded this incident as not of absolutely vital consequence, and that he deliberately aimed at emphasizing the importance of the earlier teaching by omitting the final incident.

Now, considering the great part that the ceremony had played in the Church during the long period of somewhere near seventy years, which elapsed between the Crucifixion and the composition of the Fourth Gospel, we must attach great importance to John's omission of the incident while describing the Supper. In most cases it is unsafe and unjustifiable to lay much stress on, or draw serious inferences from, the silence of an historian about an incident which he omits amid the pressure of many events for attention; but this incident is exceptional; and one cannot see how it could be omitted except deliberately and of set purpose.

Moreover, the doctrine of the Eucharist is not omitted. It is stated elsewhere. The occasion on which John records the exposition of the mystic truth that is expressed in the Rite is important, and was certainly selected by him of set purpose (chapter 6) It was the day after the feeding of the five thousand, and the day after He walked on the Sea of Galilee. There is also in the context an allusion to the betrayal by Judas: $6^{64f.}$, 'There are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.' One can hardly avoid the thought that this allusion was intended to point the connexion between this exposition of underlying truth and the outward circumstances and occasion of the Last Supper. Further, John draws special attention (6^{23}) to the occasion, just before he reports the discourse on the meaning of the food given by God: 'Nigh unto the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks';[1] and here even in this brief reference he lays special emphasis on the importance of the 'giving thanks.' And once again he makes Jesus refer to some wonderful act in His opening words: 'Ye seek me . . . because ye ate of the loaves and were filled.'

John's account of the teaching of the Master regarding the mystic truth which was afterwards embodied in the Sacrament is contained in his sixth chapter. In this chapter Jesus explained to those who on the previous day had eaten of the loaves the meaning and nature of 'the bread from heaven.' The 'Father giveth you the true bread from heaven,' and 'I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' But 'no man can come unto me, except the Father which sent me draw him.' 'I am the living bread which came down out of heaven . . . and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.'

In this discourse the gradual transition is clearly indicated from the simpler idea 'bread' through the stages 'bread from heaven,' and 'I am the bread of life' to the mystic saying 'he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him . . . he that eateth me, he shall live because of me.' But 'it is the spirit quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing' (6^{63}).

I do not profess to be able to enter so perfectly into the Oriental mode of thought as to understand fully the final form which this exposition took in the mouth of Jesus as reported by John; but the observation of the successive steps by which the simple passes into the more mystic statement, enables even a Western mind to apprehend something of the meaning that the words had in the

[1] It is worthy of note that He 'gave thanks' (εὐχαριστήσας) before He distributed the loaves (as Jn. 6^{11} expresses it); but Mark (followed by Luke and Matthew) says that He spoke a blessing (εὐλόγησεν). There is here the same variation, but differently distributed, as is found in the accounts of the Last Supper.

mind of John as he looked back in old age to that scene. Westcott remarks rightly that this discourse cannot 'be simply prophetic of the Sacrament,' and that 'it treats essentially of spiritual realities with which no external act, as such, can be co-extensive.' He quotes Augustine, 'believe, and thou *hast* eaten,' as giving the sum of the thoughts in a luminous and pregnant sentence. But, as Westcott goes on to say, 'the truth which is presented in its absolute form' in Jn 6 'is presented in a specific act and a concrete form in the Holy Communion.' And he regards the whole situation in the way that Jesus 'gave by anticipation a commentary, so to speak, on the Sacrament which He afterwards instituted.'

These words of Westcott's express the situation as well as any man can ever express for all others a truth which can be known only to one who has lived it, and which each man will express to himself in a different way according to the life whereby he has realized for himself the truth.

We must notice also that John explains why this earlier teaching had passed unobserved and unrecorded. It was beyond the comprehension of the disciples. Many of them even said, 'This is a hard saying,' and murmured at it, 6^{60}; and the reply of Jesus seems to indicate John's belief that the truth had become intelligible to him and to all only after the Resurrection and the Ascension.

IX. St. Paul is in essential agreement with the Fourth Gospel (6^{31-59}) as to the nature of the Sacrament: that the life-giving bread is Christ, and that life can be had only through eating that bread. He does not, it is true, express the principle in so mystic a form; but, when he draws the parallel between the sacrificial meal which was the force binding together the pagan society, as the communion of Dæmonic Powers, and the eating of the Eucharistic meal which was the communion of the body of Christ, and then shortly afterwards quotes the Saviour's own words, 'this is my body,' it seems irrational to doubt that he is expressing the view of the Fourth Gospel.

John's point of view is closely related to Paul's, but travels far beyond it, and reaches a different level of thought. In such a transcendental exposition of the absolute truth, there cannot possibly be any association with a fixed day, or month, or season, or year. John states the ultimate fact, which is always present as the foundation of the Divine life in man. Yet he would hardly have laid such stress on the sensuous facts of eating and drinking, unless he had had the Sacrament in his mind as he wrote.

Paul has clear before him the practical problem, how is the scattered people of God to be united in a close fellowship and brotherhood? The sole bond that could effect this union was, of course, an ideal and mystic one: no external or temporal bond was sufficient. Paul insisted to the Corinthians that the Eucharist embodied a power which was strong enough for this purpose; and it is beyond doubt that he gave the same teaching to all his other Churches. The power that lay in the Rite could operate effectively only if the participants co-operated rightly in the act. God will not and cannot help men unless they do their part: the action must be mutual. But the power always is present in the Rite; if men do not participate rightly, and fail to perform their part in the act, the Rite is not merely neutralized: it becomes a force to destroy the unworthy participator. 'He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, unless he discern,' etc.

The nature of this power that lies in the Rite of the Bread, Paul does not explain clearly in his brief statement. The Divine nature is present in the Sacrament: the Saviour is with those who worthily participate, and thus they become a unified and single body. What further teaching the Apostle imparted to his converts beyond what he says in that Epistle we are not informed; but he evidently assumes that the Corinthians had learned to know his doctrine.

John stands entirely apart from the practical problem: he does not allude to the unification of the Church as a congeries of separate individuals. He only explains the mystic doctrine that every one who rightly partakes of this food from heaven becomes united with and merged in the Saviour's personality. In that is involved the unification of the Church; but John does not descend to the relation of man to man; he speaks only of the relation of man to God.

As to Paul, one would be inclined to say that the purely idealistic character of his words could not be misunderstood, were it not that they have been misinterpreted. He says clearly that, although an idol is nought, yet to eat at the table of an idol is to imperil or destroy the life and the character of a Christian; and that 'meat will not commend us

to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse, nor, if we eat, are we the better.' These things are material and nought in themselves. They become what the mind of man makes them. All that vast power for good or for evil which Paul saw in the Sacrament was purely ideal, and lay in the spirit of the man who came to the Lord's Table, and in the degree to which he sympathized with the mind of the Saviour and with the life of the Brethren who sat along with him.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Gen. iv. 1, 2. 'Now the man had known Ḥavvâh his wife' (cf. the similar construction in 1[2]). This implies that the knowledge had begun before the expulsion from Paradise, and not immediately after it, as commentators usually assume. It was the birth of Cain which took place after the expulsion. Cain, or Cainan (v.[9]), 'the smith,' answers to the Babylonian *ummânu*; while Abel, as was pointed out many years ago by Oppert, is the Bab. Abil, 'son,' which was borrowed also by the Sumerians under the form of *ibila*. The initial vowel is represented in the Heb. transcription by ה, as in הכל, *hêkal*, from Bab. *êkallu*, Sumerian *ê-gal*; cf. also the name of Abraham for Aba-ramu. The latter part of v.[1], explaining the name of Cain from the verb *qânâh*, is a late insertion, like most of the etymological notes in Genesis; it is inconsistent with the statement in 4[26], and is unaccompanied by a corresponding explanation of the name of Abel, the reason being that *hebel* in Heb. meant 'vanity,' which did not suit the character ascribed to Abel in the history.

רֹעֵה צֹאן, *rô'êh ẓôn*, 'shepherd of a flock,' is an Assyrianism, *rêu tsîni* in Ass. being used in contradistinction to *rêu alpê*, 'ox-herd'; *rêu itstsuri*, 'bird-keeper'; *rêu sattukki*, 'keeper of the daily sacrifice, etc. 'Tiller of the ground' is a translation of the Ass. *ikkaru*, which is derived from the Sumerian *engar*, 'the ground,' and is ideographically expressed by UR-APIN, 'man of the ground'; that is to say, 'the peasant' or 'fellaḥ,' as distinguished from the NU-GISSAR, or 'gardener,' as Adam had been in Paradise. The population of Babylonia consisted of agriculturists (*ikkari*) and artisans (*ummani*), the former inhabiting the country, and the latter the town, the whole body of them being collectively called *ummânu*. In contrast to them were the uncultured West Semitic nomads, whose home was in the desert on the west side of the Euphrates, but who tended the flocks of their Babylonian masters, and many of whom pitched their tents on the river-banks of Southern Babylonia. Wool was a staple industry of the Babylonians, and the flocks were all herded by the West Semitic Beduin. Hence the shepherd represented the West Semitic Beduin, while the peasant and artisan constituted the civilized population of Babylonia. In one sense they might be called brothers, since they alike spoke Semitic languages, and a certain portion of the Babylonian people belonged to the Semitic race.

In the story of Cain and Abel, therefore, we have a reflexion of the relations between the two adjoining populations as they were regarded from the Beduin point of view. The elder brother is naturally the Babylonian master, to whom the Beduin shepherd stood in somewhat of the relation of the wife to the husband (v.[7]); he possessed metal weapons of destruction (vv.[8. 22. 23]), was the builder of cities (v.[17]), and exchanged agriculture for the artisan's craft (vv.[12. 22]).[1]

3, 4. The Hebrew translated 'in process of time' would be *ina kît yumê* in Assyrian; but the original phrase was probably *ina yumê-su*, 'at that time,' as the reference is to the time when Cain and Abel were already respectively an agriculturist and a shepherd. The ground had already been cursed (3[17]); hence the fruit of it was not acceptable to Yahweh, who had cursed it. On the other hand, Yahweh was the God of the Sutu or West Semitic Beduin (4[26]), whose offering to Him was the best of their possessions—the firstlings, namely, of their

[1] The fact that the word *ummânu*, 'smith,' came to be applied (as in the story of the Deluge) to the whole body of the Babylonian population, so as to include 'the peasant' as well as 'the smith,' would explain how Kain, the first 'smith,' has absorbed the first *amel-ikkari* (Heb. *'ish hâ-adâmâh*), or 'agriculturist,' who, according to 9[20], was really Nukhum, or Noah (see notes on 5[29] and 9[20]).

flocks, together with their milk (reading חֶלֶב instead of חֵלֶב, a punctuation due to the regulations of the Levitical Law; Lv 3^{16}).

'Yahweh regarded Abel and his offering, but Cain and his offering he did not regard.' The Assyrian equivalent of יִשַׁע is *isteni'a*, from *se'û*; but it is probable that *atû*, the synonym of *se'u*, was found in the original, since that is used in the sense which שָׁעָה אֶל has in this passage. Thus Esarhaddon says of Merodach: *ina pukhur akhêa rabûti tutta-nni*, 'among all my elder brothers thou hast regarded (*i.e.* chosen) me.' Yahweh's choice, it will be noticed, had nothing to do with the character of the brothers. A parallel passage is found in the Babylonian story of the Deluge (xi. 160–161), where the offering was of the fruits of the earth, like that of Cain: 'the gods smelt the savour, the gods smelt the sweet savour,' and consequently accepted both it and the offerer. The gods of the Babylonian agriculturist naturally preferred the fruits of Eden to the firstlings of the flock.

The ordinary Assyrian phrase was *dullukhu panú-su*, 'his countenance was troubled.'

7. A proverb is quoted in this verse of which we have the Babylonian original in the Legend of the Plague-god (K 2619. 6), [*Ur*]*ra rabitsu abulli-su*, 'the Plague-god is lying in wait at his door.' Here the Semitic Ḥaṭṭâth, used as a proper name without the article (like Tehôm, Gn 1^{2}), takes the place of the Sumerian Urra (originally Gürra). Ḥaṭṭâth is the Assyrian *khaṭîtu*, or *khiṭîtu*, 'sin,' as in the phrase: *summa khaṭîtu izir ilu-su itti-su ittalak*, 'if he hates sin, his god walks with him.' Corresponding with Ḥaṭṭâth is Sĕêth, also used as a proper name without the article, which takes the place of Haṭṭâth in the alternative form of the proverb: 'If thou doest well, is not Sĕêth (watching at the door)?' The Babylonians, in fact, regarded the *rabitsu*, or 'lier in wait,' from two points of view; he was either the demon who lay in wait to enter and punish sin, or he was the guardian-bull,' who also was a *rabitsu*, in its secondary sense of 'watchman,' appointed to prevent evil from entering the house.[1] Thus in the Chedor-laomer texts we read: 'When the lier-in-wait welcomed [the enemy], the guardian-bull (*sêdu*) of Ê-Sarra departed (from it)' (*P.S.B.A.*, Dec. 1906, p. 241). The name of the *sêdu*, or 'protecting spirit of the house,' was also employed in a wider sense to include all the spirits, whether good or evil, who 'lay in wait at the door'; even Isum, the messenger of Urra, is called a *sêdu*. *Sêdu* is also written *sêtu*, like *satê* for *sadê* (Heb. *sâdeh*) in the Tel el-Amarna letters from Jerusalem. In the proverb as quoted in Genesis *sêdu*, *sêtu*, has been assimilated to *ḥaṭṭâth*, and so made to resemble *seîtu*, 'friend' (cf. שְׂדֶה, Ec 2^{8}). The original of the Heb. version would have been: *summa tiṭibbi, Sêtu abulla rabitsu; û summa lâ tiṭibbi, Khaṭîtu* (*Urra*) *rabitsu abulla*. The meaning of the passage had been forgotten when the Septuagint translation was made.

The West Semitic Beduin kept the flocks of their Babylonian masters, to whom, therefore, they owed service. Hence, so far as mastership was concerned, the relationship was like that of the wife to her husband (3^{16}), from which also the words 'unto thee shall be his desire' have been taken. But, however appropriate these latter words may be to the husband, they are quite out of place when the relations of two brothers are in question, and consequently cannot have been in the original text. Moreover, there is no subject to 'his' and 'him.' In place of the very inappropriate 'And unto thee shall be his desire,' we need 'He is thy younger brother.'

8. There is another omission of the original text in the verse which begins, 'And Cain said to Abel his brother . . .' The words, however, are lost. The insertion of the Septuagint, 'Let us go into the field,' probably represents the sense of the original, and may have been derived from it. If so, the words must have dropped out after the period when the Septuagint translation was made.

Sâdeh, 'the field,' is the Babylonian *siddu*, and was a technical term denoting the cultivated land on the bank of a Babylonian river or canal which was watered by means of shadufs. It was, therefore, the special property of the agriculturist Cain, in contradistinction to the *edinu*, or 'plain,' where the flocks were pastured by the shepherd Abel.

9. Cain disclaims all knowledge as to where his brother is, the *siddu* and the *edinu* being distinct. His own province is the *siddu*, and, as he leaves the *edinu* to his brother, he cannot guard him from assailants, either as the *sêdu* guards the agriculturist's house, or as the nomad shepherd guards his flock. The Bab. original of Cain's

[1] In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian commissioners are called *rabitsi*.

reply would have been: *ul îdi; natsir akhiya anaku?*

10. In Assyrian it would be: *iqbi-ma: minâ tepus? qûl damê akhi-ka itsarakh* (or *tsarikh*) *ana eli-ya ultu qaqqari.* The *v.l.* צעק must be substituted for the ungrammatical צעקים, '*ṣoăkîm*' of the Massoretic text. It was the 'voice of the blood' that cried out, not the blood. Yahweh was the guardian of the West Semitic shepherds, though Cain disclaimed being so, and He would avenge their death. The blood of the murdered man called to Him from that 'irrigated soil' from which the agriculturist took his name (*ikkaru*), and which he regarded as his own property.

Contributions and Comments.

The Coat without Seam.

Does any English commentary or translation call attention to the fact, that in the description of the coat without seam (Jn 19^{23}) the words ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, 'from the top,' may be connected with the preceding ἄραφος, *seamless*, instead of with the following ὑφαντός, *woven*, which has the addition δι' ὅλου, *throughout*? The coat was without seam from, *i.e.*, at the top, or the upper parts. No German book which I have been able to consult mentions this possibility. And yet it is followed not only by Cyprian and the Codex *c*: *de tunica autem quia de superiore parte non consutilis, sed per totum textilis fuerat*, but also by the Syriac translation, which is rendered by Gwilliam: 'tunica autem eius erat absque sutura a summo, contexta tota' (דלא חיטא מן לעל . וקירתא כלה).[1] This explanation, which needs only the removal of a comma, seems to be recommended by the gloss of the lexicographer Hesychius (quoted already by Wettstein, 1752), who defines σύμπορπον as τὸν μὴ ῥαφαῖς συνειλημμένον κατὰ τοὺς ὤμους χιτῶνα, the coat which is not kept together by seams on the shoulders; and the description of the priest's dress by Josephus (*Ant.* III. vii. 4): ἔστι δὲ ὁ χιτὼν οὗτος οὐκ ἐκ δυοῖν περιτμημάτων ὥστε ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων εἶναι καὶ τῶν παρὰ πλευράν: this coat does not consist of two sheets, so that it would be *sewn together on the shoulders* and at the sides.' The expression of Josephus, (μὴ or οὐ) ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων is = ἄραφος ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν. There are editions of the Greek Testament which have no comma either before or after ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, but I know of none with a comma after ἄνωθεν.[2] In the *D.B.* I looked under 'Coat' and 'Seam' in vain for some elucidation about the 'seamless robe'; the *D.C.G.* makes the omission good under 'Coat,' giving a reference under 'Seam' to this article.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

[1] James Murdock, in his literal translation from the Syriac Peshitto Version renders: 'And his tunic was without seam from the top, woven throughout.' In the Syriac Codex from Sinai the passage is missing.

The Aramaic Name of the Passover.

The *D.B.* states in the art. 'Passover' (iii. 688): '*Name.*—פֶּסַח, J.-Aram. פִּסְחָא, Syr. ܦܨܚܐ, and hence πάσχα.' A similar statement is repeated in *D.C.G.* ii. 324: '(Heb. פֶּסַח, *pesaḥ*; Aram. פִּסְחָא, *pAsḥa*; in Greek, πάσχα,' etc. In the *E.B.* I do not find a reference to the Aramaic form, but in Preuschen's *New Dictionary of the Greek Testament* I meet the same statement—'Aram. פִּסְחָא.' It is not necessary to multiply references.

In reality the Aramaic form is פִּסְחָא(י), *pis-ḥā*; see Dalman's *Grammar* (2nd ed., p. 138; correct in the Index under πάσχα, the wrong reference '126'), or E. Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, p. 10, who wrote twenty-five years ago: 'The Jewish tradition demands פִּסְחָא, with which also the Syriac *pes-chā* corresponds.' It is the same difference of pronunciation that we have in Miryam—Maryam; Simson—Samson, etc.

When Dalman, *l.c.*, thinks the π of πάσχα due to assimilation with πάσχω, I cannot see why the

[2] A similar difference of punctuation, to which the A.V. and R.V. do not call attention, is Rev 5^{1}: 'A book written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals'; to which punctuation others prefer: 'A book written within, and on the back sealed with seven seals.'

Greek translators of the O.T. should have felt themselves reminded of this Greek root by the Aramaic name of the Hebrew Festival. It is, of course, quite different with the people of the early Church. In other books of the Septuagint we have the transliteration φάσεκ. Did the originators of this form think of φάσκειν? EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

"Worthily."

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1910, page 383, you call attention to an article in the *Missionary Record* by Mr. Philip, on the word 'worthily' in the New Testament. Three occurrences of the word are mentioned—Ro 16[2], Ph 1[27], 3 Jn [6] and the inconsistency of translation in the A.V. and R.V. is pointed out. But why not note the three other places where the word occurs, Eph 4[1], Col 1[10], 1 Th 2[12], and also the further fact that the American Standard Version gives 'worthily' in each place except Ph 1[27], where 'worthy' is retained with the margin as in R.V., 'behave as citizens worthily'? It is not the first time that after reading some criticism of the R.V. in some English periodical, I have turned to the A.S.R.V. and found the reading that the critic says ought to be in the text. These six places are the only ones where the Greek word appears, and ought to be studied together in any study of the word 'worthily.' It will then be found even more helpful than the study to which you refer.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Auburn Theological Seminary, New York.

An Outline of Assyrian Grammar.[1]

THIS Outline of Assyrian Grammar will be found of very great service by students, and will form a convenient *vade mecum* for those engaged in the decipherment of tablets. It is the work of a scholar who shows himself conversant with every department of the study. The texts selected are a proof of this. One is historical, two epistolary, and six commercial. There is also given a Babylonian proverb, a list of Babylonian proper names, many of which have a Biblical reference, and a page of Babylonian Students' Exercises. One of the chief merits of the book is that it keeps before the view the Babylonian system of writing, which differs materially from the Assyrian. This difference is well exhibited in a list of 333 signs giving the Babylonian characters with their Assyrian equivalents. The list would have been of still more service had the numbers been co-ordinated to those of the Sign-list (pp. 49–58), which contains 366 signs with their syllabic and ideographic values. The list of the months on p. 60 will also be very helpful. The grammar itself calls for no detailed criticism. A feature of it is the introduction on every page of examples of Assyrian and Babylonian writing alongside the transcription, by which the student is familiarized with the cuneiform at the same time that he learns to master the language. The section on Numerals is specially instructive. The Verb receives lucid treatment.

The texts (two in number), facing the title-page, are new, as are those on p. 62 (Nos. 1–3). No. 4 on p. 62 and Nos. 1 and 2 on p. 63 are found in Professor Stevenson's Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts. These three contain Aramaic reference notes, here reproduced with their Hebrew equivalents. A comparison with Stevenson brings to light several minor differences, mostly in numbers. *Ginû*, not translated by Stevenson, is transliterated by Pinches *gin-na*, and rendered 'standard (?).' (The reference is to [white] silver shekels.) No. 2 on p. 63 gives the substance of the tablet as 'the price of the meal for the Arabians (?),' as against Stevenson's (No. 36) 'the price of . . . , belonging to the Aramæan.' (Ar-ba-a-a *v.* Ar-ma-a-a.)

The docket to No. 1, p. 63, reads: 'Concerning the silver which he has given to Iribaya.' From this it is concluded that 'the last element of the name Sennacherib should be read not erba, but -îriba(y)a or -êriba(y)a. The ending -a(y)a was apparently dropped.' To substantiate this, reference is made to No. 28 of the list of names on p. 63, where the Babylonian writing is attended by the Aramaic equivalent=אריבי, and is read Iriba-a ('he (the god) has augmented'). The feminine name Arabatum, p. 64, 34*a b*, may also be compared. On the other hand, one notes that the

[1] *An Outline of Assyrian Grammar*, by Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S. Pp. vi, 64, 8vo, cloth lettered, 5s. London: H. J. Glaisher, 55 and 57 Wigmore Street, W. 1910.

syllabic spelling of 9*b* on the same page is Bêl-er-ba.

On p. 46, l. 12, 83-1-18, 268 should read 82-3-23, 268, cf. p. 62, note *. The reference is to an Aramaic word שבא, probably Šaba, which, however, Stevenson reproduces ישבר (ב doubtful), and translates 'the weaver (?).'

Pp. 49–64 are autograph, and are executed with the utmost care. The only cuneiform sign that causes trouble is p. 64, 24*b* (No. 5). Defects in the writing otherwise are to be found: p. 50, ll. 4, 37; p. 51 (2nd col.), l. 14; p. 52 (2nd col.), l. 21; p. 53, l. 3; p. 54 (2nd col.), l. 6; p. 56 (2nd col.), l. 44.

The Outline is designed to be 'the forerunner to a much more complete and detailed exposition of the language, though the issue of such a book will probably depend upon the success with which the present Outline may meet' (see Preface). Success the Outline well merits, because of its accuracy, its comprehensiveness, and its suitability to the needs of the ordinary student of the language. In view of the large amount of cuneiform writing contained in the book it is marvellously cheap.

WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK.

Kinneff.

In Necessariis Unitas.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of February 1907, Professor E. Nestle contributed an interesting article on the authorship of this beautiful saying, which is found in the writings of Richard Baxter, and was a favourite quotation of Dean Stanley's. The article by Bertheau, in Herzog, leaves it somewhat doubtful if R. Meldenius, whom Professor Nestle proves to have been Peter Meiderlin of Augsburg, is the real author of the phrase. May not R. M. and R. Baxter have quoted from a common source, since Baxter says the words are the 'old despised words of the pacificator?' A closer examination of Baxter's work shows that he has really quoted from R. Meldenius. The extract from Baxter, given by the German scholars, is really a secondary one from the preface. I find on reading the book itself, viz. *The True and Only Way of Concord of all the Christian Churches*, London, 1680, that in Part iii. p. [25], Baxter says: Sect. xiv. 'Were there no more said of all this subject but that of *Rupertus Meldenius, cited by Conradus Bergius*, it might end all schisms if well understood and used, viz. "Si in necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in utrisque charitas, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae." Unity in things necessary, liberty in things unnecessary, and charity in both, would do all our work.' Baxter was writing more than fifty years after Meiderlin, so he might well call his words 'old.' He mentions a great many other 'pacificators' besides R. Meldenius, especially the Scotsman, John Dury, but he shows no knowledge that R. M. is an anagram.

DAVID M. W. LAIRD.

New College, Edinburgh.

The Date of the First Gospel.

ARCHDEACON W. C. ALLEN'S article on this subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July is a striking illustration of the present tendency of scholars to go back to old-fashioned views. Just sixty years ago, the Rev. T. R. Birks, who was afterwards a Cambridge Professor (I think of Moral Philosophy), published his *Horæ Evangelicæ*, in which, *inter alia*, he argued for a still earlier date for 'Matthew,' not later than 44 A.D. Among his reasons one is worth recalling. St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John in their crucifixion narrative always speak of Pilate by his name, not as 'the governor'; but Matthew seven times mentions 'the governor' without his name. Would a writer have naturally used the phrase in that way after 44 A.D., when for the first time a successor of Pilate bore the same title? So urged Birks; and, of course, it was part of an argument for 'Matthew' being the first Gospel written, a view now abandoned.

EUGENE STOCK.

London.

The Story of Samson.[1]

DR. STAHN is a thoroughgoing advocate of the mythological view. For him 'an investigation of the Bible stories of Samson is a task for the science of comparative religion' (p. 1). He therefore compares the various episodes in Samson's life

[1] *Die Simson-Sage: Eine religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung über Richter 13–16.* Von Dr. Hermann Stahn. Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht. Pp. 81. M.2.40.

with corresponding narratives of Herakles, Dionysos, Ra and Isis, and other gods and heroes of ethnic religions, and finds the doughty hero to be a manifestation of the sun-god worshipped in the neighbourhood of Beth-Shemesh, whose cult was finally displaced by that of Jahweh some time after the reign of David (p. 78 ff.). The personal character and adventures of Samson are all brought under this category. The name שִׁמְשׁוֹן is probably a modification of שֶׁמֶשׁ, *the sun*, carried out in the interests of pure Jahweh-worship. His seven locks are the sun's golden rays, which wax bright and strong at midday, but are shorn off at nightfall. His birth is compared with the miraculous origin of Herakles and Perseus—both of them solar heroes. His adventure with the lion has also a solar significance—the lion being the symbol of the sun's might among many ancient nations. The burning of the cornfields by the blazing foxtails is likewise a symbolical representation of the action of the sun. Even Samson's dwelling in the cleft of the rock of Etam symbolizes the midnight resting of the sun in his 'hole' beneath the earth. His blinding also relates to the failure of the sun's light at even. The snapping of the bonds represents the bursting forth of the sun in his morning glory. The two pillars of Dagon's temple are the 'pillars of heaven' through which he bursts. His death is the final extinguishing of the light. And even his enthralment by Delilah symbolizes the nightly conquest of the sun; the name דְּלִילָה being but another form of לַיְלָה, *night* (p. 32 ff.).

Comparative mythology has won its rightful place as a science. But it must not presume to dominate the whole field of human thought. By the comparison of isolated details, every historical fact and personality may readily be resolved into insubstantial elements in a mythological scheme. In this way, Jensen has recently educed practically the whole of ancient history from the Gilgamesh *motif*. No doubt, mythological speculations play a large part in the life of ancient nations. But life itself is more than mythology; and the main interests of men have always been in life. The idealizing imagination of primitive peoples delights chiefly to play around figures of flesh and blood. In our mythological studies, therefore, we must not lose sight of the actualities of life. The attribution to Samson of adventures that assume quite superhuman proportions, or even the weaving of ætiological myths like the origin of the names Ramath-lehi (Jg 15^{17}) and En-hakkore (Jg 15^{19}) into the web of his life-story, is no real proof that he is a mythological figure. We find precisely the same phenomena in all folk-lore. Legendary elements tend to cluster round the heroes of popular tradition. But the actual personality of the hero must first be there for the wreath of honour to cluster round.

It must be remembered, too, that the influence of mythology wanes as we approach the age of contemporary history. The adventures of Samson stand on the very threshold of such an age. The Philistines have already appeared on the scene, and Israel has been drawn into its life and death struggle. This is no age for sun-myths, but one for daring deeds. The popular imagination of Israel has thrown a nimbus of more than mortal glory around the head of its hero. But Samson does emerge to view as the first heroic figure who dared to withstand the hated enemy, and wrought them deadly mischief. On this reading of his story, the somewhat strange blending of the national and religious finds its explanation. In Israel's struggle with the Philistines the cause of Jahweh was involved. Therefore the champion of the people was the champion of their God as well. Samson's personal character fell far short of the standard of ethical religion. But his deeds of prowess against the common enemy caused him to be regarded with truth as one raised up and called by Jahweh to fight for His honour, one whom the spirit of Jahweh stirred to heroic enterprises.

A. R. GORDON.

Montreal.

When did Stephen Langton die?

THE name of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, is dear to every learned friend of the Bible as the name of the man to whom we owe its division into chapters. But when did he die? One set of books says 1227, the other 1228. It would be easy to multiply quotations; let it suffice to quote one for each statement, both published by the Publishers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

A. Stewart (article 'Bible,' *D.B.* i. 288) says: 'Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, died 1227,' referring to Gregory, *Prolegomena to Tischendorf's N.T.*, 8th ed. p. 164. But there

Gregory says: 'mortuo a. 1228,' and he repeats the same year as late as 1907 in his *Canon and Text of the N.T.*, p. 473: 'Cardinal Stephen Langton, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1228.'

Which is the true date? EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Acts xxi. 39.

THE striking parallel from Xenophon to 1 Jn 3^{19}, published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, reminds me of another parallel.

In Ac 21^{39} almost all editions punctuate Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης; Westcott-Hort, on the contrary, Ταρσεὺς τῆς Κιλικίας, οὐκ, etc., as in 22^{3}. The very same difference of punctuation occurs in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, I. ii. 23. Most editions that I have seen punctuate εἰς Ταρσούς, τῆς Κιλικίας πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα; only Rehdantz, εἰς Ταρσοὺς τῆς Κιλικίας, πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα. In both cases I am inclined to agree with the minority.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Where were the Disciples?

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxi. p. 379, Professor Mackintosh makes the very reasonable suggestion that while Jesus was engaged in His Judæan ministry, the disciples were busy upon one of their evangelizing journeys, and asks whether this view has ever been proposed before.

Like him, I can find no reference to it in Dr. Smith's book, *The Days of His Flesh*. On the contrary, Dr. Smith seems to believe that upon the journey described in Jn 7, Jesus was accompanied by the Twelve (p. 301).

The view suggested by Professor Mackintosh has been advocated before, however. In his book, *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (Scribner's, 1904), Professor C. A. Briggs, of Union Seminary, New York, devotes the fourth chapter (pp. 40–49) to a discussion of the question: 'Where was Jesus during the absence of the Twelve?' and he finds the answer in the Judæan ministry recorded by John. 'I have asked several eminent New Testament scholars this question,' he says, 'but not one of them had thought of it before, or could give me an answer' (p. 40, note). The theory advanced by Professor Briggs is that Jesus divided Galilee among ten of the Twelve, sending them out two by two, and Himself accompanied the remaining pair, James and John (cf. Lk 9^{51-56}), on a mission to Peræa (cf. Lk.), and Judæa. The two brothers would naturally be taken into Judæa because of their evident familiarity with the capital. This would also account for John's minute record of the incidents and conversations in Jerusalem. This view 'fills the gap in time which the absence of ten of the Twelve required by a sufficient amount of active ministry of Jesus to satisfy all conditions of the problem' (p. 49). I have only hinted at the reasons which Professor Briggs states at some length in this most interesting chapter. And this chapter, Professor Briggs tells us at the close of his preface, was printed as an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November 1903.

M. B. DAVIDSON.

Toronto, Canada.

Recent Foreign Theology.

New Testament.

1. *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, von Caspar René Gregory: Dritter Band. The third volume is just as necessary for the student of the New Testament text as the first or second. To others it is nothing at all. Yet the volume should have a considerable sale in this country. For the references to British scholarship are very numerous, much more numerous than the references to German scholarship or any other (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M. 12).

2. *Euangelium Gatianum.* Dr. Joseph Michael Heer of Freiburg has produced an edition of the Codex Gatianus, which contains the four Gospels in a Latin version. He has furnished his edition with Latin prolegomena and textual footnotes. This Codex, which Dr. Heer proves to have been of Irish origin, is of special importance in that, while agreeing on the whole with the Vulgate, it

contains readings, and those not a few, which are in accord with some of the oldest manuscripts of the Gospels, not to speak of some remarkable readings which are peculiar to itself (Freiburg: Herder. M.14).

3. *Die Stammbäume Jesu nach Matthäus und Lukas.* Dr. Heer is also the author of a volume on the Genealogy of our Lord according to the First and Third Gospels. One cannot be sure, but it does not seem likely that the subject has ever before received such a thorough investigation as this is. There are three appendixes. The first is on the ancient Damnatio Memoriæ. The second is a study by Herr Leo Wohleb on the co-ordination of sentences in the narrative style of St. Matthew's Gospel. It contains tables of the number of occurrences of various Greek particles. The third appendix exhibits Mt 1^{16} according to the more important versions and manuscripts (Freiburg: Herder. M.6).

4. *La Vie privée du Peuple Juif à l'époque de Jésus Christ.* This is not simply a history of the Jews in the time of our Lord; it is a study of their private life,—a very much more difficult matter to study than their public and political life. It is a contribution to the literature of the Social Problem quite as much as to the literature of Ancient Israel. The author, Père M.-B. Schwalm, has endeavoured to make his book as complete as possible, but the references to modern literature are comparatively few. Probably there is not much modern literature to refer to (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910).

5. *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben.* In this volume Professor Dr. Hermann L. Strack gives the texts, translation and annotations on all the passages in Hebrew which were written by Jews in the earliest times about Christ or Christianity. Those who know Dr. Strack are well aware that he is the last man to do this for the purpose of raising prejudice against the Jews. His object is just the opposite of that; it is to remove foolish prejudice (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910).

6. *La Résurrection de Jésus.* To their 'Bibliothèque Apologétique,' Messrs. Beauchesne of Paris have added a volume on the Resurrection, by Abbé E. Mangenot, Professor of Sacred Scripture at the Catholic Institute in Paris. Abbé Mangenot has no doubt about the fact of the Resurrection, but he knows that other people have doubts, and respects them. He knows the French literature best, and the German literature next. Of Loisy he has naturally much to say. The volume contains two appendixes, one on the Crucifixion, and the other on the Ascension (Fr.3.50).

7. *Les Sources du Récit Johannique de la Passion,* par Maurice Goguel, Professeur à la Faculté libre de Théologie protestante de Paris (Paris: Fischbacher, 1910).

8. *Wellhausen und Johannes,* von Caspar René Gregory (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910).

9. *La Valeur historique du Quatrième Evangile.* Professor Lepin of Lyons has already made himself known by the issue of several theological and critical works, but more especially by the publication of a volume on the authorship and origin of the Fourth Gospel. That volume has already reached a third edition. The author has now issued in two volumes a study of the historical value of the same Gospel. It is the work of a Roman Catholic, but it is in much closer agreement with the best British scholarship on the subject than is the work of average German Protestantism at present. The author's acquaintance with English Biblical literature is evident on every page. He feels as he writes, and we feel as we read him, that in the study of the Gospel according to John no such distinction as Roman or Anglican is even for a moment to be remembered (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1910. Fr.8).

10. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus.* Dr. Martin Debelius has in this volume examined all the passages in St. Paul's Epistles which touch upon angels or spirits. His purpose is purely scientific, not apologetic, and the volume is a valuable storehouse of information on this difficult and now much derided subject. The indexes of subjects, Greek words, texts, and references to ancient Christian and pagan literature will be particularly useful (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister, 1909. M.7).

11. *Die Thessalonicher-Briefe.* In the new edition of Meyer, the Epistles to Thessalonians have been edited by Professor Ernst von Dobschütz of Strassburg, the author of the great article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* on the 'Bible in the Church.' Professor von Dobschütz is a man of extraordinary range of knowledge, which he carries so unconsciously that to make his acquaintance is one of the greatest pleasures of one's

life. Here, we should say, nothing that will elucidate a reference in the Epistles escapes him. But more than the weight of learning is the evidence of genuine spiritual sympathy with the Epistles themselves (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister, 1909. M.6.40).

12. *Épitres de Saint Paul.* Professor G. Toussaint of Rochelle has published the first volume of Expositions of the Pauline Epistles, or, as he calls it, 'Lessons in Exegesis.' The volume contains an exposition in paragraphs of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Epistle to the Galatians, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians. The exposition is in each case preceded by an introduction to the Epistle, and to the whole work is prefixed an account of the Apostle's life and ministry (Paris: Beauchesne et C^ie^, 1910. Fr.5).

13. *Der Hebräerbrief in zeitgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung.* Under this title Dr. Bernhard Weiss has published ten essays on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which he discusses almost all the great questions which arise out of a study of the Epistle itself. It is the custom with our own expositors to give what they call 'Additional Notes.' These are the 'Additional Notes' to Hebrews of a great German commentator, and they will stand to be compared with Westcott's on the same Epistle (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910. M.3.50).

Entre Nous.

Count Leo Tolstoy and the Study of Religion.

In the *Christian Commonwealth* for June 29 there is published the translation of a long letter which Tolstoy has sent to the editor of the Russian review entitled *Life for All.* He says that for some time he has been impressed with the necessity of encouraging men to make a thorough study of religion throughout the world, and he has himself determined to edit a series of books or pamphlets each dealing with some religion or aspect of religion.

'I consider,' he says, 'a knowledge of the elements of the religions of the world by which the whole of humanity has lived and lives to be one of the most important and necessary branches of knowledge for every man, and ignorance in this respect one of the principal reasons of the weakening of religious consciousness among the people of our times, among the majority of people, the so-called lower classes, as among the so-called intellectuals. The weakening of religious consciousness among people of the working classes is caused, in my opinion, pre-eminently because those people are educated in complete ignorance of the beliefs of other nations, and in the assurance of the exclusive truth of their own religion. Educated in that manner, people of the working classes at the present stage of their intellectual development naturally meet, in the religious assertions taught to them as certain truth, some which they are already unable to believe. And at the same time all the maxims of the faith taught to them are so indissolubly bound up with the acknowledgment of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures and the infallibility of the Church that, not having the strength to separate the more essential truth from the less essential, people cease to believe the whole teaching of the Church.'

Also.

Dr. A. C. Dixon of Chicago has sent to *The Sword and the Trowel* for July a study of some of the occurrences in the Bible of the word 'also.' He takes these passages.

Mt 10^4^, 'Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.' He calls this the also of shame. That 'also' has added to the name of Judas the epithet with which it will ever be associated — 'Judas the traitor.'

Ro 5^3^, 'We glory in tribulations also'; or, as in R.V., 'Let us also rejoice in our tribulations'—the 'also' of tribulation. The Apostle says that we rejoice in hope of the glory of God—our faces are toward the sunrise. But we look around us also, not regarding the sorrows of life as out of harmony with its joys and hopes. These two aspects of life should not fight a duel, but play a duet.

2 Ti 1^5^, 'The unfeigned faith that is in thee; which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy

mother Eunice; and, I am persuaded, in thee also.' This is the 'also' of expectation. What Paul *saw* in Lois and Eunice he expected of Timothy; and so persuaded was he that the same faith would be found in him, that he calls it the unfeigned faith that *is* in thee.

Lk 10[39], 'She had a sister called Mary, which also sat at the Lord's feet and heard his word'—the 'also' of devotion. This 'also' is Mary's vindication. She attended to her household duties; she also sat at Jesus' feet. Once a day at a certain hour a white handkerchief fluttered from the tent door of General Gordon. It was the hour of prayer within the tent. Gordon did his duty as a soldier; he also sat at Jesus' feet.

Mk 1[38], 'Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also.' This is the 'also' of the evangelist, the 'also' of the missionary. We are to tell those at home the good news; we are also to tell those abroad. Beginning from Jerusalem, that men who know us may take knowledge of us, let us go into other towns also, and on into all the world.

Jn 14[3], 'That where I am, there ye may be also.' It is the 'also' of final fellowship; it is the hook of steel which binds us to one who is more than a friend, to a Brother. Let us treat Him here, says Dr. Dixon, as we expect Him to treat us there.

Pink and Blue.

When she went to the party, Elizabeth Lou
Had her hair tied on top with a ribbon of blue.
But she hadn't a very good time, and I think
'Twas because of a girl with a ribbon of pink.
'For all the girls chose her, the whole evening through,
Just because she wore pink!' sobbed Elizabeth Lou.

At the very next party, Elizabeth Lou
Wore a ribbon herself of a roseate hue.
But would you believe it? That same girl was there
With a bowknot of blue tying up her brown hair,
And the very same thing proved again to be true:
'They still like her best!' wept Elizabeth Lou.

Now between you and me, it had nothing to do
With those crisp little loopings of pink and blue.
But one little girl wore a smile on her face,
The other a frown in the very same place.
A smile and a frown! Now which of the two
Do you fancy was worn by Elizabeth Lou?

PAULINE FRANCES CAMP.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. James Mursell, City Tabernacle Baptist Church, Brisbane, to whom a copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for September must be received by the 1st of August. The text is Ps 1[3].

The Great Text for October is Ps 4[6]:

'Many there be that say, Who will shew us any good?
Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.'

A copy of Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, or Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Inge's *Faith and Knowledge*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Ps 8[3. 4]:

'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps 9[9. 10]:

'The Lord also will be a high tower for the oppressed,
A high tower in times of trouble;
And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee;
For thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee.'

A copy of Durell's *Self-Revelation of our Lord*, or two volumes of Plummer's *English Church History*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 11[3]:

'If the foundations be destroyed,
What can the righteous do?'

A copy of Forrest's *Authority of Christ*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is not always in the more elaborate articles of the *London Quarterly Review* that one finds the greatest interest. It is often in those informal contributions that are thrown together at the end. In the number for this present quarter there are estimable articles, carrying much weighty information, and written by men of the eminence of Professor Findlay, of Headingley College, Leeds. But the life of the *London Quarterly Review* this month lies in four short informal papers modestly hidden away under the general title of 'Notes and Discussions.'

One of these papers is called 'A New Way in Apologetics.' It gives an account of that recent movement in Germany which is known by the name of 'Evenings for Discussions on Religion' (Religiöse Diskussionsabende). Professor Tasker, of Handsworth College, Birmingham, who writes the note, makes no comparison between this movement and our own 'Pleasant Sunday Afternoons.' For the only thing common to them is the confession that the working-man will no longer come to the Church, and therefore the attempt must be made to take the Church to the working-man. But the easy hour in the afternoon, the cheerful solo singing, the short optimistic address, are far removed from those evenings of determined and protracted discussion, sometimes heated with outbursts of long-cherished hatred of the Church of Christ, and always reaching to the very foundations of life and creed, which are taking place in Germany.

The 'Discussion Evenings,' says Dr. Tasker, were instituted neither as evangelistic agencies nor as aids to sectarian propagandism. They appeal to the artisan's delight in public discussions on topics of interest. Their success proves that religious questions still hold a foremost place among the subjects in which he is keenly interested, although he may be estranged from the Churches. A man of this type refuses invitations to listen to pulpit exhortations, and he is not attracted by æsthetic ceremonial. In short, his attitude of mind is such that he is most likely to be impressed by arguments brought forward in a fair discussion in which difficulties are frankly stated and as frankly faced.

The Discussion Evenings are not confined to working-men. In Berlin a monthly theological 'evening' is attended by the well-educated, and that to an average of six hundred persons. One of the elementary principles of the movement is that local conditions must be carefully considered. And so, in Saxony, where even the artisan will not attend, and no 'Discussion Evenings' can be held, visits are paid to the meetings of the labour societies, the working-men's clubs, and the

like, whenever suitable subjects are found on their programmes.

There is another paper in these Notes and Discussions which deserves attention. It is an encouragement to preachers to consider the science of Psychology.

For 'certainly,' says Professor Frederic PLATT, who writes the paper, 'psychology at present carries the honours among those studies, not distinctly professional, which contribute greatly to the preacher's success.'

'To the modern preacher,' continues Professor PLATT, 'the study of psychology is an imperative duty. The most spiritual member of his order has much to learn from it—and probably almost as much to unlearn. It defines and illuminates the processes of conviction, conversion, and sanctification which he aims to stimulate and guide; and even more, it defends these as essential human experiences for which the economy of mental development is prepared and expectant.'

How is it, then, that this study has suddenly become so imperative to the preacher? Some will answer, because it has been so cleverly and persistently boomed. Professor PLATT answers, because a complete revolution has taken place in the study of the mind. The ideals and methods of the Mental Philosophy of a quarter of a century ago have been forsaken. The study of the mind is no longer merely analytical and descriptive; it is experimental and organic. The fact that the new psychology is physiological, based on the correlation between mind and brain, is itself significant of the importance of the change.

There are certain spheres of inquiry and of knowledge which have already been illuminated with light thrown upon them by the processes and facts of psychology. Anthropology, folk-lore, the rise and growth of myth and magic, comparative ethics—all these and more look upon the results of psychological research as fundamental. Now these spheres of inquiry or of knowledge form the very borderland of the realm of the preacher. Between them and the region of human life in which the preacher has his being, the partition, says Professor PLATT, is very thin. Psychology has itself broken down the partition. Within the last few years it has found a home where religion dwells. It now claims to be indispensable for the interpretation of religious experience to our generation.

It is a long time since the Gospels were first accused of being 'tendency' writings. And perhaps it is because evil communications corrupt good manners that we no longer resent the accusation. After all, we say, why should they not be written with a tendency? How could they help being written with a tendency? A tendency is just a purpose. And if St. John, for example, wrote his Gospel for the purpose of proving that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, is he to be blamed for selecting his materials to suit his purpose? A writer in *The Biblical World* for May, the Rev. W. P. BRADLEY, Ph.D., believes that all the Gospels have a tendency. They differ in the degree of it. But he is sure that he can prove both the tendency and its variety.

He believes that he can prove it by means of the history of John the Baptist. He takes the Gospels in the order in which everybody takes them now: first, St. Mark; next, St. Matthew or St. Luke (it does not matter which); and then St. John. And he believes he can show that St. Mark relates the history of the Baptist in its most historical form; that St. Matthew and St. Luke 'improve' it for their special purpose; and that St. John 'improves' it most of all.

Mr. BRADLEY takes the statements in the Gospels about the Baptist separately. The first statement is that John the Baptist's ministry secured wide attention. This is altogether as we should have expected. Any one who came with news of the Messiah was sure of at least a hearing. Especially

was he sure of a hearing from the common people. For they had nothing to lose and everything to gain by the coming of the Messiah, who was to 'put down the mighty from their seats, and exalt them of low degree.' And John had, in addition, the ascetic appearance, the desert fare of carob beans and wild honey, the shaggy garments of camel's hide, and the leathern girdle holding them together. His supreme fearlessness was in his favour. His scorching rebuke reminded the people of Elijah, whose return Malachi had promised 'before the great and terrible day of the Lord.' With all these advantages the Baptist was sure to obtain a strong hold of the hearts of the common people.

And the first three Gospels unreservedly say that he did so. Why should they not? The Baptist was the harbinger of the Messiah. But the Fourth Gospel mentions neither multitudes nor preaching in connexion with the Baptist. 'We shall not be surprised at this,' says Mr. BRADLEY, 'after we proceed a little farther.'

The next statement is that the Baptist declared publicly and in strong language his own inferiority to the coming Messiah. And in this all the four Gospels agree. But St. Luke and St. John tell us that his declaration was really a disclaimer. St. Luke says that all men were reasoning in their hearts whether the Baptist was not himself the Messiah. When John heard of their 'reasoning' he uttered an indignant remonstrance.

But the account of the disclaimer is much more elaborate in the Fourth Gospel. It represents the reasoning of the people as greatly disturbing the hierarchy in Jerusalem, and declares that the latter appointed a special ecclesiastical committee and sent it down to take John's denial officially. Not only so. The denial in the Fourth Gospel is far more comprehensive than in the Synoptics. John declared that he was not the *Messiah*, *nor Elijah*, *nor that prophet* (like unto Moses), but only a voice, a witness to the Coming One.

Mr. BRADLEY draws particular attention to the Baptist's denial that he was Elijah. The Synoptists, he says, know nothing of it. On the contrary, St. Mark and St. Matthew tell us that John was the Elijah who was to come, and they give Jesus Himself as their authority. Mr. BRADLEY believes that it is all part of a deliberate purpose. The party of John the Baptist had a powerful influence while the Fourth Gospel was being written. It was to lessen that influence that the Evangelist withheld from John all official status other than that of a 'witness' to Jesus.

The third statement is that John did no miracle. Mr. BRADLEY sees no reason to deny it. But only the Fourth Gospel tells us so. That is to say, it is the Gospel which attaches the greatest weight to the 'signs' of Jesus that tells us John the Baptist did no sign.

The fourth statement is that John preached the baptism of repentance 'unto remission of sins.' It is the Synoptists that tell us this. What do they mean?

Do they mean that the ministry of John brought remission of sins independently of Jesus? If they do, Mr. BRADLEY is sure that they said so only under the pressure of an over-mastering force of tradition. But perhaps they mean only that John's preaching prepared the way for the remission of sins by Jesus. Mr. BRADLEY is sceptical. If that is all they mean, they take, he says, a curiously blind and inadequate way of expressing their meaning.

But in this case he sees progress in the tendency of the Gospels, progress in a tendency to push the Baptist into the background. St. Mark says that John preached repentance unto the remission of sins. St. Luke says the same in his Gospel, but refrains from it in the Acts. St. Matthew retains the confession of sins, but is silent as to their forgiveness. Last of all, the Fourth Gospel says nothing about either confession or forgiveness.

The only function which John's ministry retains apart from the witness to Jesus, is the baptism of water.

The next statement is that John recognized Jesus when He appeared, and gave testimony to His Messiahship. But who tells us this? Not St. Mark, and not St. Luke. And the silence of St. Mark and St. Luke is to Mr. BRADLEY astounding. For John was certainly considered the forerunner of Jesus by both these writers, and yet they do not mention that he recognized Jesus or proclaimed Him to be the Messiah. St. Matthew does tell us that John recognized Jesus and was reluctant to baptize Him. But the recognition was only private. It is not until we turn to the Fourth Gospel that we find the Baptist bearing testimony publicly and in unmistakable terms to the official dignity of Jesus. And so far, says Mr. BRADLEY, are the Synoptists from sharing this opinion with the Fourth Gospel, that they tell us that the last thing which John did was to send some of his disciples to Jesus to ask if He was the Messiah, or if the Messiah was yet to come.

The last statement is that John's disciples, some of them if not all, left him and attached themselves to Jesus. Again the statement is found in the Fourth Gospel, and in the Fourth Gospel only. According to the Synoptists, the disciples of John were with him even after Herod had put him in prison. And when he was beheaded they took up his body and buried it. They were quite friendly to Jesus, for they came and told Him of the death of John. But it is not said that even then they attached themselves to Him.

There is evidence, on the contrary, says Mr. BRADLEY, that after the death of the Baptist his disciples remained distinct and independent, and continued to 'look for another.' The evidence is found in the facts regarding Apollos and certain others at Ephesus.

Apollos belonged to Alexandria. Twenty years after the Crucifixion he was still arguing mightily from the Old Testament Scriptures that the Messiah was coming (Acts 18^{25}). The exact words are: 'He taught accurately the things concerning Jesus.' But the sense of the whole passage makes it clear to Mr. BRADLEY that he taught accurately the things concerning the *Messiah*, and that it was not Apollos yet, but the writer of the Acts, for whom Jesus and the Messiah were synonymous terms. At any rate it is stated distinctly that he knew only the Baptism of John. Coming over to Ephesus to preach there also, he was convinced by Priscilla and Aquila that Jesus was the very Messiah whom he had been expecting and preaching. And from that time there is no abatement of power or eloquence. He crossed over to Corinth, and began truly to preach the things concerning Jesus.

Meantime St. Paul arrived in Ephesus. Here he found about twelve persons who were adherents of the faith of John the Baptist. There is no evidence that they had any connexion with Apollos, and Mr. BRADLEY thinks it is quite improbable. For if they had been converts of his they would certainly have heard from him about Jesus, and about the gifts of the Spirit, before he departed for Corinth. It is therefore evident that so late as the third missionary journey of Paul the followers of John the Baptist continued to form a distinct and widespread party.

Now Mr. BRADLEY does not say that the Fourth Gospel is guilty of deliberate misrepresentation when it states that certain followers of John the Baptist attached themselves to Jesus. But he says that at the time when the Fourth Gospel was written there was evidently a considerable party who knew nothing of John as the forerunner of Jesus, but revered him solely for his own sake; and that it was the interest of the Evangelist to show that even during the lifetime of John some at least of his followers acknowledged Jesus to be the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world.

'And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd' (Jn 10^{16}).

What is there in this verse that is worth attending to? There is the change of 'fold' into 'flock' made by the Revisers in the end of it. And certainly that change is worth attending to. 'The translation *fold* for *flock*,' says WESTCOTT, 'has been most disastrous in idea and in influence.' But we know that now. All that remains for that is to acknowledge it in practice. Is there anything else in the verse?

There is nothing else. The commentators are unanimous that there is nothing else in this verse worth commenting on. 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold'—these are the Gentiles, they say. The Gentiles are outside the Jewish fold, and will never be brought within it. For the Jewish fold is to be broken down. When the Gentiles 'hear my voice,' they shall be brought, not within the Jewish fold, but into the Christian flock. There shall be one flock, Jews and Gentiles together and indistinguishably composing it, as there shall be one Shepherd. So say the commentators unanimously. Turn the second 'fold' into 'flock,' and they find no other difficulty.

But there are other difficulties. First of all there is the difficulty that our Lord is not accustomed to call any persons His sheep until they have believed on His name. Is there any example elsewhere of this name, or any name like this—believers, disciples, or any other—being applied to persons who have not yet become followers? And not only have these sheep, if they are Gentiles, not yet become followers; they have not yet heard of the existence of Jesus. The vast majority of them have not yet been born.

Then there is the difficulty of the words, 'I must bring.' WESTCOTT prefers 'I must lead,' and argues rather earnestly for it. But he did not persuade the rest of the Revisers. For the words have a strong personal reference. This is evidently a duty which our Lord felt to be His own and to be urgent. 'I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day'; 'I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the day following'; 'Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice.'

Now, when we appreciate the force of these difficulties, and then consider who these 'other sheep' may be, we remember that there are certain persons of whom our Lord used the very words which He uses here. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead *shall hear the voice* of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live' (Jn 5^{25}).

The Rev. R. W. HARDEN, B.A., who is not a novice in the art of exposition, has written a small book on *The Gospel in Hades* (Combridge & Co.; 1s. net). The book is occupied chiefly with an interpretation of the famous passage about preaching to the spirits in prison. But this text in the Fourth Gospel is interpreted also. And Mr. HARDEN believes that its proper interpretation is to refer the 'fold' of the beginning of the verse to that Christian fold in which the disciples were safely sheltered as long as Jesus was upon the earth, the 'other sheep' to those who believed in God but passed away before the Incarnation, and then the 'flock' to that great multitude of saints, both of the old dispensation and of the new, who are gathering round the throne of God and of the Lamb.

If the period of the criticism of the Bible has come to an end, what has it done for us? If we have entered on the period of reconstruction, what form is the reconstruction likely to take? The editors of the *Biblical World* believe that they are able to answer that question. They give their answer in the issue for July, under the title of 'A New Type of Christianity.'

Their title is 'A New Type of Christianity.' It is not 'The Reconstructed Bible.' For they consider that the criticism of the Bible has never been an end in itself. Always, when it understood itself, it was a means towards a better knowledge of Christ. If we had a wholly new Bible, we should not necessarily be better Christians. Unless the criticism of the Bible has brought us nearer Christ, it has been in vain. What the editors of the *Biblical World* look forward to is properly and necessarily a new type of Christianity.

They do not mean, however, that the new type of Christianity which they look forward to will be cut off from the Christianity that has gone before. It is Christianity itself that is to become new. As the Apostle says, 'Old things have passed away, behold *they* have become new.' What they mean is that the old Christianity has of late been undergoing changes which are numerous enough and serious enough to entitle them to speak of the outcome as a new type of Christianity.

Accordingly, they proceed to enumerate the characteristics of the new type of Christianity that is at hand. One characteristic is 'its thoroughgoing acceptance of the maxim, "Whatsoever is true."'

But, surely, there is nothing new in that. Has any Christian generation, has any individual Christian, ever admitted that their supreme purpose was *not* the search for truth? The editors of the *Biblical World* are aware of it. And yet they hold to their claim. They believe that in the days that are at hand the truth will be sought with more disinterestedness, and embraced with more genuine affection than it has been—well, since the days of the Apostle Paul.

And they bring their belief to the test. If there is, let us say, a controversy between Geology and Genesis, the New Christianity will follow Geology. It will hold that the record left in the strata of the earth cannot be impugned by a poet of the pre-scientific age, even though that poet be also a prophet of a higher conception of God than had before his day prevailed. If, again, there is a controversy between the records of history contained in the Books of Chronicles and those discovered on the Assyrian monuments, the statements of the Books of Chronicles will not be preferred to those of the monuments, although the religion of the Chronicler may be far better than that of the Assyrian stone-cutter.

Another characteristic of the new Christianity will be its insistence on character more than upon creed. It will recognize 'the possibility that an honest man may be in great perplexity on many questions of doctrine, and yet be sincerely and wholly devoted to the practice of the principles which Jesus taught and exemplified.' Hence it will welcome to its fellowship men of widely different types of theological belief or doubt, but it will exclude from its fellowship men of widely different moral purpose. Not that it will be without theology; nor that its theology will be a string of negatives. But it will lay the emphasis on those doctrines which make for character and conduct, not on those which offer scope for intellectual discussion.

A third characteristic of the new type of Christianity will be the emphasis it will lay upon *doing*. It will not be particular about agencies. Whatever agency is found most convenient and effective will be made use of, even though a member of the S.P.G. should have to work alongside a member of the L.M.S. Nor will it be careful to save the face of such ancient doctrinal favourites as the inherent depravity of man or the inherent badness of all non-Christian religions. Its aim will be to make Christianity Christian in spirit and in deed, and to cover the earth with it.

These are the leading characteristics of the Christianity that is about to come, these three. There is one thing left to be asked about it,

Will it be Christianity? It will be scientific; it will be ethical; it will be practical. Will it also be religious? If the new Christianity does not teach men to love their God with all their heart, in addition to, or rather in front of, loving their neighbour as themselves, it will not be Christianity.

The editors of the *Biblical World* believe that the struggle will be here. But they believe that the Christianity we are coming to, will insist upon the reality of the spiritual, and upon the necessity of fellowship between man and God.

The Present and the Future Kingdom in the Gospels.

By Percy Gardner, Litt.D., LL.D., Professor of Classical Archæology in the University of Oxford.

Every student of the problems of the Gospels is aware that of late there has appeared in Germany, France, and England a strong tendency to lay great stress on the eschatological element in the Synoptic writings. For many years past the ordinary view of criticism had been that when Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God, He may in a measure have shared the views of His contemporaries that a mighty convulsion was at hand, but that His teaching in the main had to do with the present, and was ethical rather than apocalyptic; that the Kingdom of which He spoke was in the hearts of men, not waiting to be revealed in the skies. But Johannes Weiss, in his remarkable paper of 1892, asserted that the phrase 'Kingdom of God' was used by Jesus only in the eschatological sense, that for Him the Kingdom was not partly present and partly future, but wholly future and supernatural, a sudden catastrophe. Dr. Schweitzer carries further the view of Weiss. He also thinks that by Jesus the Kingdom of God was expected to come in a great catastrophe. He observes that the ethics of Jesus belong only to a time of expectation, their end is to make men free of the world, and ready to enter unimpeded into the Kingdom. When he uses the term 'Son of Man' he is thinking only of the exalted being spoken of in Daniel, who is to come in the clouds of heaven, and to whom is given dominion over all peoples. Passages in which the 'Kingdom of God' or the 'Son of Man' are spoken of in another sense are to be cleared away.

This rigorous and *a priori* method of criticism seems to Dr. Schweitzer the only criticism worthy of the name. He greatly rejoices over the epoch-making pamphlet of Weiss. 'At last,' he writes, 'there is an end of "qualifying clause" theology, of the "and yet," the "on the other hand," the "notwithstanding."' Weiss 'lays down the newest great alternative which the life of Jesus had to meet, *either* eschatological *or* non-eschatological. Progress always consists in taking one or other of two alternatives, in abandoning the attempt to combine them.'[1]

Dr. Sanday, with his usual generous appreciation, has highly praised the treatise of Dr. Schweitzer. Learned it is, no doubt, and valuable as a record of the history of criticism, and clear, and full of up-to-date expressions. And beyond question, the man who consistently and clearly uses an extreme theory as a key to unlock historic problems does clear the air. He illumines men's minds, and makes them see whither arguments tend. On account of this merit we may pardon an extreme theorist a good deal of pedantry.

But, in compensation, systems of such extreme simplicity and logicality have drawbacks. They sometimes make up for the triumph of massacring *buts* and *notwithstandings*, and marching straight to their end, by outraging common sense, and constructing a house of cards, which, however fine to look at, will not resist a breath of wind. If their principle is faulty, their consistency only makes them the easier to refute.

The purely eschatological interpretation of the Synoptic teaching as set forth by Weiss and Schweitzer admits, I think, of a complete refutation. Such refutation one cannot, indeed, extract solely from a study of St. Mark's Gospel, because it is a document which may be interpreted in many ways, and stands at the end of a considerable

[1] *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 237.

period of Christian development. To the end of time, probably, critics will differ as to many points in the life and teaching recorded in this Gospel. In the future, as in the past, every thoughtful reader will find in the Jesus of St. Mark a figure which will in some degree conform to his expectation.

But we have in the New Testament other documents of a less flexible temper. No serious critic doubts that in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians we have the words of St. Paul. Here we may excavate the text with confident hope that we shall find treasure. We can learn with certainty what St. Paul said and thought. We ought to take our start from the Epistles, since in all science the right method is to proceed from the better known to the worse known. St. Paul uses the phrase 'Kingdom of God'; and his use of it furnishes a conclusive argument against the theories of Dr. Schweitzer. For what is actual in the mental attitude of St. Paul, cannot be ruled out as impossible in the thought of his Master.

That St. Paul expected a catastrophic return of his Master we are certain, since in two long passages he describes that return as he expects it. He thinks that the existing world is about to pass; that all human relations, such as marriage, are of a temporary character. Soon the Kingdom of God is to arrive; Jesus Christ is to reign in a spiritualized world, inhabited by the spiritual bodies of the Saints. Flesh and blood cannot dwell in that Kingdom, any more than can the unrighteous. But while the Kingdom of God is thus in the future, it is also in the present, and on the earth.

In St. Paul's writings, the phrase 'the Kingdom of God' does not often recur, but when it is used, it is as often regarded in the present tense as in the future. In Ro 14^{17} he writes: 'The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.' Obviously here the Apostle is speaking of conduct in accord with the divine will. Eating and drinking, about which some Christians had scruples, are declared by him to be in themselves indifferent; what really matters is a life in the Spirit. And this life is one lived in the present on the earth. In 1 Co 4^{20} St. Paul writes: 'The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.' He is opposing those who with boastful speeches have claimed to better his teaching: and he demands that the controversy between him and them shall be decided not by words, but by spiritual power, for it is in that that the life of the Church which is God's realm consists.

We find a similar view, though differently expressed, in a later Epistle, also generally regarded as Pauline, that to the Colossians (1^{13}). Here the Apostle is speaking of the causes which the converts have for joy and thankfulness. The chief of these is that God delivered them out of the power of darkness, and translated them into the Kingdom of the Son of His love. Obviously, since this deliverance has already taken place, the Kingdom into which they are admitted cannot be in the future.

In these and other passages St. Paul evidently uses the phrase 'Kingdom of God' as equivalent to the Church of Christ. And so we cannot be surprised that usually in connexions in which his Master would have used the phrase, he uses the word 'the Church' instead. The Church is the reflexion and embodiment on earth of the divine Kingdom. In the Church the will of God is done, although not so fully as it is done in heaven.

In some instances it is almost impossible to say whether, in speaking of the Kingdom, St. Paul means the future realm or the existing society. For example, in 1 Thess 2^{12} he bids the disciples behave in a manner worthy of their vocation, since God calls (or called) them to His own Kingdom and glory. It is not possible here to say with precision whether the Apostle is thinking of the calling as members of the Society, or as heirs of a future Kingdom. The present and the future are but two sides of a status of salvation to which Christians have attained.

Alas for St. Paul! He does not understand the conditions of German criticism! He weakly speaks of the Kingdom as future, and at the same time as present. He falls into the snare of *but* and *notwithstanding*. He even dares, in company with all the great leaders in the history of the world, to be inconsistent, and to direct his writings rather to the building up of a Church and the salvation of his hearers, than to the formulation of a thoroughly thought-out system of interdependent propositions.

But surely no serious student of the Pauline writings can for a moment doubt which was primary in St. Paul's thought, the present or the future. The future dwelt in the background of his mind, and doubtless often dominated his meditations, but it was the present state of the Church, its morality, its beliefs, its relation to the world around, which made the working purpose of his life. He was sane, and so practical; he was a missionary, and most eager to found on the visible earth the divine Kingdom for the good of which he lived. History shows that great mystics often have a depth of worldly wisdom which goes far beyond that of the men who do not see beneath the surface of things.

When we turn back from the Pauline Epistles to the words of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, we find precisely the same confusion of present and future which we noted in St. Paul. The Kingdom of God is sometimes spoken of as future; as the rule to be established by the Messiah when He comes upon the clouds of heaven as the Judge of mankind. And much is said in St. Mark, though it does not all come from Jesus, as to the events which shall precede and give token of that coming. But in a far larger number of passages, as any one who uses a Concordance may see, the Kingdom is spoken of as present, as already existing beneath the surface of the visible, in the hearts and wills of men. 'The kingdom of God is like unto leaven'; 'The kingdom of God is within (or among) you'; 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' Why should I repeat all these sayings, which are familiar to every child?

Jesus does not refer, as does St. Paul, to an existing society, but to an invisible spiritual Kingdom, in which God's will is done. The Gospel of the Kingdom is more fully developed in the First Gospel than in the Second; but in several passages in St. Mk. it is clearly proclaimed. In the parables recorded in Mk $4^{26\text{-}32}$ we have the same idea which is so prominent in the Matthæan parables of a Kingdom growing up and spreading in the hearts of men. In Mk 12^{34} when Jesus says to the scribe, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God,' it is not possible to consider the saying, if rightly reported, as referring to a future apocalyptic Kingdom, of the time of which the speaker is not Himself aware; it must refer to a present and spiritual realm beneath the surface of the visible. In Mk 10^{12} the saying, 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein,' must refer to a Kingdom into which men can enter by a disposition of intention and of life, not to one into which they may at some future time find entrance. The mixture of present and future in the Marcan teaching of Jesus exactly corresponds to that in the Pauline Epistles, although in the one case the Kingdom is invisible, in the other it has become in a certain measure visible.

But Dr. Schweitzer proceeds, with utmost vigour and rigour, to rule out or to reinterpret these words. Either they are wrongly reported, or they are misinterpreted, or they belong to post-resurrection times. Have we not the right to ask him, before he lops the luxuriant branches of the Gospels into the closely cropped trees of a Dutch garden, to try his thesis on the Pauline Epistles? The disciple believed in the approaching end of the world, but he at the same time believed in a present and inward divine Kingdom. What right have we to assume that the Master did not do the same, that to Him the Kingdom was not in two tenses? Jesus was a prophet; and to the Jewish prophets the future and the present were inextricably mingled. Through the present they saw the future, and the future lay already determined beneath the surface of the present. Their minds were not mapped out as rigidly as the system of the modern theologian would desire. Dr. Schweitzer accuses the great contemporary theologians of Germany, Bousset and Wernle and Harnack and the rest, of importing into the life of Jesus the ideas of modern Protestantism. To read the past in the light of the present is a tendency that none of us can wholly escape. But there could scarcely be found a more extreme example of yielding to that tendency than is furnished by Dr. Schweitzer, when he demands of the Founder of Christianity a logical precision of thought utterly foreign to His age and country. To adopt a striking phrase of Dr. Schechter, 'Whatever the faults of the Rabbis were, consistency was not one of them.' From the earliest days to our own they seldom clearly distinguish the present from the future Kingdom.

The question whether the primacy in the teaching and life of Jesus belongs to the practical

or the apocalyptic side of His beliefs is no doubt a matter as to which various opinions may be held. I am altogether on the side of those who regard the apocalyptic side as comparatively unessential, though I am aware that much may be urged to the contrary. But to assert, as does Dr. Schweitzer, that it is a question of *either—or*, and that the apocalyptic side of the teaching is the only side, seems to me a quite unmaintainable theory in the face of St. Paul's Epistles.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

Psalm i. 3.

'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water,
That bringeth forth its fruit in its season,
Whose leaf also doth not wither;
And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.'

The subject of the First Psalm is the advantage of being good. And that in this life. In the First Psalm, as in all the Old Testament, God is a rewarder, even here, of them that diligently seek Him. It is well with the righteous, it is ill with the wicked, now, in this life. The evidence was not always on the surface. A superficial view of the world told against the doctrine rather than in its favour. And the Psalmists were not always superior to the temptation of counting the proud happy. Yet it was experience that originally taught them that the lot of the righteous was better than the lot of the wicked; and an enlarged experience, confirmed by faith in God, always brought them back to that conviction. The First Psalm is a good introduction to the whole Psalter.

The Psalm is divided into two parts, each of three verses. The first part describes the righteous man and his lot; the second, the character and lot of the wicked man. The good man is first described negatively, in contrast to the bad man. He does not walk in the counsel of the wicked, nor stand in the way of sinners, nor sit in the seat of the scornful. In the second verse he is described positively, and by himself. He is one who delights in the law of the Lord and meditates in it day and night. Then, in the third verse, the writer rises to the height of his great argument, and in a passage of singular beauty describes what God has laid up in store for him that loves Him and keeps His commandments. *First*, he shall reach the perfection of his being, the completeness of that life which is his—'he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water.' *Next*, he shall accomplish the service for which he has been prepared, using appropriately and beneficently the gifts which God has given him—'that bringeth forth its fruit in its season.' *Thirdly*, he shall enjoy a perpetual freshness and interest in life—'whose leaf also doth not wither.' And *fourthly*, all his actions will be crowned with success—'whatsoever he doeth shall prosper'; or if we take the marginal reading, 'in whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper,' everything will work together for his good. The meaning is really the same.

I.

Fulness of Life.

'He shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water.'

To the Psalmist the life of devotion to the good was in no wise a thing of gloom; it was the only life that was rich and full as life could be. To delight in the law of the Lord did not mean that the nature was starved, deprived of its heritage, despoiled of the bloom and beauty whereby it ought to be adorned: consecration to holy things brought no emptiness, no dulling of life's brightness, no toning down of its joy: the man of spirituality was not left standing like some worn and scarred tree whose day of fruitfulness and grace was for ever gone by; he possessed, rather, the secret of perpetual youth and unfailing strength and undying gladness. He should be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season: upon him there should descend no barrenness of winter; but in him, and upon

him, there should always rest the sweetness and beauty of spring.[1]

It is one of the charges frequently cast against religion that it belittles human nature too much, and makes man feel that in this world he is hardly of any account at all; and religion treats man, they say, as if he were a rotten bough which deserves to be lopped off, and is only spared by the forbearance of the husbandman, rather than as a tree which brings forth its fruit in its season. And that in the truly consecrated life there will be, and must be, a consciousness of failure and a shamed realization that often and often the husbandman has come seeking fruit and finding none, is, of course, one of the elementary commonplaces of religious truth. But there is another side which is not to be ignored; and if in the consecrated life there comes first of all the sense that we are worth nothing, there should come next the sense that we are worth something, because through our consecration we become witnesses to and influences on behalf of the supreme thing, the best thing, in all the world. Delighting ourselves in the law of the Lord, we stand now for that which is dearest to God; and to do that is to make life great and to give life a worthy place.[2]

Among the many images under which the good man is described in Holy Scripture, perhaps there is none more vivid, says Newman, more beautiful, and more touching than that which represents him as some favoured and thriving tree in the garden of God's planting. Our original birthplace and home was a garden; and the trees which Adam had to dress and keep, both in themselves and by the sort of attention they demanded, reminded him of the peaceful happy duties and the innocent enjoyments which were the business of his life. A garden in its perennial freshness and its soothing calm is the best type of heaven, and its separate plants and flowers are the exactest types of its blessed inhabitants. Accordingly it is introduced into the last page of Scripture as well as into the first; it makes its appearance at the conclusion of man's eventful history as in the record of its opening. As in the beginning we read of the Paradise of pleasure, with the great river and its four separate streams, with all manner of trees, fair to behold and pleasant to eat of, and, above all, the Tree of Life—so, in the last chapter of the Apocalypse, we are told of the river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb, which he that thirsteth may drink freely; and of the Tree of Life, bearing twelve fruits, the leaves of which were for the healing of the nations.[3]

[1] H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 44.
[2] H. W. Clark, *ibid.* 49.
[3] J. H. Newman, *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, 243.

The reference is clearly to the date-palm, one of the most important and valuable fruit-trees of these regions. It has frequently been suggested that it is the lovely oleander, 'the willows by the watercourses,' which screen, with their perennial shade, every river and brooklet in the land, and for weeks, in the early summer, shed a glowing sheet of pink over the fringe of every watercourse. But the oleander does not meet the conditions of this comparison; it is not planted, but indigenous, and it bears no fruit. The date-palm alone meets all requirements. Though it will grow in almost any soil, it will never bear fruit unless within reach of water; and as it is a dicœcious tree, with the stamens and pistils on different plants, it very rarely yields fruit except under human care. It is true, one often sees palm groves where there is no apparent sign of water, in the most barren deserts. But the wandering Arab knows well that, wherever he sees a palm tree, he has but to probe deep enough to find water below.[4]

In order that the palm tree may attain the perfection of a palm tree, it has to be planted by the streams of water. In order that a man may reach the height of his manhood, he must surrender himself to God, who will appoint him his place and bring him his nourishment.

1. A Tree planted.—It did not plant itself. It surrendered itself wholly and utterly to the husbandman. He took it in hand and dealt with it, and that was the beginning of its prosperity. This utter and whole-hearted surrender of ourselves is the first step in the blessed life. The Husbandman must have possession before he can do any planting. Let us see this very plainly. The difference between those who are the Lord's and those who are not, is not that some are born religious; it is not that some have been brought up in the midst of religious influences; it is not that some people believe certain theories and creeds, and others either do not understand them or do not think about them. It is not a matter of understanding. The religious life is a matter of *will*, of *choice*, of *surrender* to God.[5]

It is not the tree, but the planting and the place, that constitute the blessedness. So, then, do not let us think that we are the wrong sort. I have seen, in old-fashioned gardens, trees that have been cut and hacked and twisted into all sorts of fantastic shapes: peacocks and pagodas, and I know not what else. Alas for the trees that think they must be turned into peacocks before they can prosper! There are two kinds of religious people in the world: there are those who always want to be somebody else, and there are those who want everybody else to be exactly like themselves. Now, the woods need all the kinds of trees that

[4] H. B. Tristram, in *S.S. Times*, 19th March 1892, p. 185.
[5] M. G. Pearse, *The God of our Pleasures*, 71.

God has made; and the world wants all the kinds of people that God has sent into it. Some people are, perhaps, very different from what God made them, but He wants us to be every one after his kind. As I walked through the woods the other day, I thought within myself how it would spoil everything if there sprang up a quarrel as to which was the *right* kind of tree. If the poplar contended proudly that everybody should stand upright, and make the most of himself; and the birch said it was a sign of grace to bend one's self on the earth, and told the poplar not to be so stiff! If the hawthorn sneered at the holly because it had its winter suit still; and the holly put up all its prickles and said, If it remembered rightly, the hawthorn had no winter suit to boast of. No, no; they mingle together, and each lends the other a new beauty, and the variety is the charm and play of the whole. The Heavenly Father made them all, and ministers to them all, and has a purpose for them all.[1]

'Those that are planted in the house of the Lord shall flourish in the courts of our God.' It is the triumph of faith when we are brought to see how God not only provides but applies everything necessary for the perfection of man's salvation; and when, looking out of ourselves, we can discern a covenant 'well ordered and sure,' to the terms of which He has bound Himself. He 'cannot lie'; and the believer feels that, accepting salvation on His terms, he is not only reclining in the arms of boundless love, but is firmly resting on the Rock of eternal truth. It is well that God does all; it is our 'strong consolation.'

I was looking the other day at a tree that stood tall and flourishing, a perfect picture, and my friend told me that he had stuck a piece of stick in the ground and looked after it. 'And now,' he said, 'it has come to that.'[2]

Dr. John Paton, speaking of Namakei, his first convert on the island of Aniwa, says: 'He went in and out with intense joy. When he heard of the prosperity of the Lord's work, and how island after island was learning to sing the praise of Jesus, his heart glowed, and he said, "Missi, I am lifting up my head like a tree; I am growing tall with joy."'

2. By the Streams.—There is not only the rock to hold on to, but there is the river to refresh it. Rock and river, river and rock, this is what the law of God becomes. They who do not know think the law of God is hard and stern as the voice of thunder, with its *Thou shalt*. But they who do know cry, 'Great peace have they that keep Thy law.' It is rivers of water, sweet, refreshing, quickening. We think of the law as a command, but we come to find it a promise. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.' The word awes me, frightens me, withers me. But lo! as the Blessed Lord comes on His way He speaks: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.' It is not a command, but a promise, a pledge, and the very word brings the fulfilment.

There is a celebrated vine at Hampton Court that for many years disappointed the gardener's hopes. It was quite healthy, but there were few grapes. One year, however, it was unexpectedly laden with clusters of the finest fruit. Seeking to discover the cause of this, the gardener laid bare its roots, traced their ramifications, and found that they had suddenly gone through the banks into the Thames. It had 'sent forth its roots to the river,' and thenceforth ceased not from yielding fruit in richest abundance.

II.

Seasonable Fruitfulness.

'That bringeth forth its fruit in its season.'

This tree planted by the streams of water does not stand there for naught: it brings forth fruit in its season. Not only does it realize itself: it fulfils a worthy use.[3]

Every righteous life must end in fruit. The greenness and the beauty are but a form of promise. The inexorable condition on which life is given is that it should reach forward to fruit-bearing. He bore His fruit—in due season God fixed, and He still fixes, the season. The long tarrying in Nazareth, the brief ministry, the early and cruel death, the short sleep in the grave—all of them were timed and planned by the Eternal Wisdom and Love.[4]

If we would really bring before us what is both the highest blessedness in God's service, and also, in fact, the ordinary portion of good men, we shall find it to consist in what from its very nature cannot make much show in history,—in a life barren of great events, and rich in small ones; in a life of routine duties, of happy obscurity and inward peace, of an orderly dispensing of good to others who come within their influence, morning and evening, of a growth and blossoming and bearing fruit in the house of God, and of a blessed death in the presence of their brethren. Such has been the round of days of many a pastor up and down Christendom, as even history has recorded, of many a missioner, of many a monk, of many a religious woman, of many a father or mother of a family, of many a student in sacred or profane

[1] M. G. Pearse, *The God of our Pleasures*, 67.
[2] M. G. Pearse, *ibid.* 70.
[3] H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 49.
[4] W. Robertson Nicoll, *The Garden of Nuts*, 119.

literature,—each the centre of his own circle, and the teacher of his own people, though more or less unknown to the world.[1]

I live for those who love me,
For those who know me true;
For the heaven that smiles above me,
And awaits my spirit, too;
For the cause that lacks assistance,
For the wrong that needs resistance,
For the future in the distance,
And the good that I can do.

III.

Perpetual Freshness.

'Whose leaf also doth not wither.'

The leaf is the thing of the spring-time. It is the first thing that comes. How soon it loses its delightful freshness! How soon the sweet greenness passes into the darker shades of summer, and becomes sere and yellow in the older days of autumn! But my text speaks of a religious life whose leaf shall retain its freshness through all the changing days. The spring glory shall not wither as the years roll away. The beauties of the spring-time shall continue through all the seventy years. The characteristic charms of childhood shall never be destroyed. Life shall grow. It shall increase in knowledge. It shall broaden in experience. It shall open out large capacities and powers. But amid all the many and varied developments the beauties of childhood shall remain. 'His leaf shall not wither.'[2]

It is an evergreen, in which, while the leaves do fade and fall away, according to the universal law of life, they do so without being marked; in which there is no long interval of winter desolation, but a constant succession of foliage, keeping the tree always fresh and green. The leaf of the tree belongs to the tree itself. It is the part that is peculiar to its individual life. By it the tree breathes and forms its wood from air and sunshine. It is its strength, it is *itself*; for the whole tree is simply a modification and development of the leaf, as it is most certainly the creation of the leaf. The leaf, therefore, represents the righteous man's own life. Not only does he do good to others by self-sacrificing labours, and thus keep up the general blessedness of the world, but he gets good to himself. His own life is blessed. Nothing can keep the heart fresh and young and joyful amid the cares and changes of life like the godliness which is to a man's nature what sunlight is to a plant.[3]

What are the leaves which make childhood so beautiful? They are these—hope and sympathy. These are the fresh green adornments of the spring-time of life. How many of us lose them as life passes forward into its prime. That is a wonderful word in the Apocalypse, wherein we are told that 'the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.' If ever the wounds and sorrows of the world are to be healed, it will have to be by the leaves of the tree of life, the green leaves of the spring-time, the leaves of hope and sympathy. It is the child-like disposition which is to heal the world's broken heart.[4]

There are some who by their pursuit of holy things seem to be made the most crabbed and unlovely people on the face of the earth. And still the Psalmist's doctrine may stand. If our professed delight in the law of the Lord does not make us like trees planted by the streams of water, we had better look to see whether there be not something wrong with our professed delight. Take it as a truth—devotion to goodness keeps the heart young. Consecration brings the joy of constant freshness upon heart and life.[5]

There are four seasons in thy spiritual year—the winter of desolation; the buds of spring, which tell of hope; the warmth of summer, which bespeaks the fulness of the heart; and the ingathering of autumn, which is the time for life's practical fruits. Each season has its fruit, and the fruit is in its turn golden. Do not seek to change the order of God's spiritual year; do not seek to put the fruits of one season into the lap of another. Thou must not expect the buds of spring from the desolation of winter, for desolation is the fruit of winter; thou, like Nicodemus, must begin thy journey in the sense of night—night without a star. Thou must not expect the warmth of summer from the buds of spring, for the fruit of spring is not fruition but hope; thou, like Peter, must be content for a time to live on aspiration alone. Thou must not expect the practical ingathering of autumn from the warmth of summer, for the fruit of summer is not action but emotion;

[1] J. H. Newman, *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, 246.

[2] J. H. Jowett, *Meditations for Quiet Moments*, 120.

[3] H. Macmillan, *Two Worlds are Ours*, 207.

[4] J. H. Jowett, *ibid.* 121.

[5] H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 48.

thou, like John, must be content to lie on the Master's bosom until thy time to work for Him shall come.[1]

A few days ago I called to see an old Christian who, too, is waiting for her translation, having nearly reached her ninetieth year. To her, life, as seen from the hilltop in the glory of the setting sun, seems a wondrous and beautiful thing, as indeed it is when it has been lived in loving service for God and man; and she has no word of complaint, but only of praise and thanksgiving to God. Across every page of her life-story she says there is written in letters of light, 'goodness and mercy.' Trials, yes, she has had them, but these have made the longing for the homeland deeper. Pain, yes, the old body suffers sometimes, day and night, but she can still sing 'Rock of Ages,' and 'I know that my Redeemer lives,' and it helps her when the hours are long and the nights are dreary. Like Billy Bray, the Lord has given her vinegar with a spoon, and honey with a ladle. And just when she was mourning that she could *do* nothing more for her Lord but just *be* a Christian in thought and deed, He graciously gave her something to fill up the measure of her days. A little grandchild came into her life, and in all this city there is no more beautiful sight than the old white-haired saint and the golden-haired child bending over the big Bible and looking at the pictures, while the grandmother tells stories which never lose their charm—of Joseph and Moses, and Daniel, and the Christ-Child, for whom the world had no better cradle than a manger. And her cup of joy is full to the brim, and all she can say is, 'Bless the Lord, O my soul.'[2]

'Whose leaf doth not wither.'

Never a heart, O God,
Grown sere and old,
Its streams of passion and of pain all spent,
Its tale all told;
Never an empty heart,
All ivied o'er,—
But one made wise to love and to be loved
More and yet more.
No withered winter tree,
Sapless and bare,
Lifting its leafless arms from the lone moor
To the bleak air,—
But planted, Lord, within
Thy Holy Place,
To strike new roots each day in the rich soil,
And grow in grace.

IV.

Unfailing Prosperity.

'And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.'

The Jewish doctrine of retribution expressed in the psalm is, according to our ideas, too superficial: we cannot believe that piety and external welfare always go together. Yet this doctrine is founded on a fundamental conviction of all higher religion—the conviction that piety must bear fruit, and that religion is not merely a subjective experience—rather that the pious man receives God's blessing and guidance.[3]

1. If we judge human life fairly and according to our best convictions, we shall probably come to a conclusion similar to that of the Psalmist, and even identical with it, though we may not express it in so absolute and unqualified a form. We see many exceptions, or many apparent exceptions, to the rule, but still we do hold it for a rule of life, that goodness thrives and reaches a good end, while badness languishes, tends to, and actually comes to, a bad end. By neither path, perhaps, do men reach their end *at once*, or soon. The ungodly, the sinner, and the scorner may swagger by us, and, with the world, the flesh, and the devil to help them, they may make a brave show for a time; but if we watch them carefully, we shall see their 'way' perishing behind and even under their feet, so that they cannot hark back even when they see the place of their torment before them, and can only with great labour and peril climb up into some better way. And, for a time, the good man, as he sits meditating on the law of the Lord, or delights to do His will with busy hand and eager foot, may see the world go by him, or hear its laugh of contempt, and feel lonely, hurt, forsaken. But has he lost so very much in losing the company, the smile and approval, of the world? Others grow rich, he keeps poor; others win reputation, he remains unknown; but if his character has been really formed by the Law in which he studies and delights, if in these brief hours of time he has really laid hold on eternal life, if he can smile at Fortune and her wheel because all changes, whether adverse or prosperous, bring him nearer to God, is he very much to be pitied for his loss? *What* has he lost after all? He has lost 'the chaff,' which is the sport of every wind, and which at last the wind of death must carry away. What has he gained? He has gained a place by that stream of living waters which carries life, fertility, fruitfulness, wherever it flows. The man who is sincerely

[1] G. Matheson, *Moments on the Mount*, 79.
[2] S. Horton, *Christian World Pulpit*, lxx. 116.
[3] H. Gunkel, in *The Biblical World*, February 1903, p. 123.

good grows ever better, while the man who is really bad grows ever worse. Goodness tends to *life* in its highest sense; and badness to *death* in its saddest sense.[1]

God does *actually*, though not completely, *make men blessed here*. Our text sums up the experience of all the devout hearts and lives whose emotions are expressed in the Psalms. He who wrote this Psalm would preface the whole by words into which the spirit of the book is distilled. It will have much to say of sorrow and pain. It will touch many a low note of wailing and of grief. There will be complaints and penitence, and sighs almost of despair before it closes. But this which he puts first is the keynote of the whole. So it is in our histories. They will run through many a dark and desert place. We shall have bitterness and trials in abundance, there will be many an hour of sadness caused by our own evil, and many a hard struggle with it. But high above all these mists and clouds will rise the hope that seeks the skies, and deep beneath all the surface agitations of storms and currents there will be the unmoved stillness of the central ocean of peace in our hearts. In the 'valley of weeping' we may still be 'blessed' if 'the ways' are in our hearts, and if we make of the very tears 'a well,' drawing refreshment from the very trials. With all its sorrows and pains, its fightings and fears, its tribulations in the world, and its chastenings from a father's hand, the life of a Christian is a happy life, and the joy of the Lord remains with His servants.[2]

2. Take the marginal reading, and you get at the essence of the idea. 'In whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper'—whatever may be the precise external result of his doing, *he himself* shall get something out of it, and be the more prosperous in soul. Not that to the man who delights in the law of the Lord the failures and distresses of other men do not come—not that they are for the devoted man magically changed somehow, so that failures and distresses are in themselves something different for him from what they are for anybody else, though that is sometimes made out to be God's promise, which it is not—but that through all the failures and distresses, his fate, because he has linked it with holiness, remains unaffected and untouched. He prospers in all he does, because in truth he does but one thing. His life, being wrapped up in that which is good, goes on its way deeper and deeper into the good whatever may betide. The interest in which he is bound up is not to be touched by the things which happen in the outward world. He is safe, because temporal loss cannot diminish spiritual treasure. In whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper.[3]

A man is worth what he is, not what he has; and that is true both of this world, and of that which is to come. While he lives, he may win and lose everything but one—his own personality. That is always his; ultimately it is all that is his. In that lies his worth, if he have any; not in the abundance of the things which he possesses and can lose. And when he dies he loses what he has, but he remains what he is. He who is unjust will be unjust still; he who is holy will be holy still; but he who is wealthy, will be wealthy no more. It is a painful tribute to the commercialism of our age that a rich man is said to be worth so much when he dies. If he is worth no more than what he left, he is worth nothing; and in the other world, which, with all his foresight, he has forgotten or ignored, he will start a bankrupt if he start at all.[4]

Of all the sermons that I ever heard, says the Rev. Samuel Chadwick, the one which made the profoundest impression on me I heard when I was not more than ten years of age. Samuel Coley was the preacher. I was a little chap in a big chapel at the back of the gallery. He quoted the First Psalm. When he came to the sentence, 'And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper,' he said, 'It is not what he thinks he will do, not what he hopes, and is going to do, not what he half does, not what he does ten minutes too late, but whatsoever he doeth promptly and thoroughly and heartily, and with both hands, to the Lord, it shall prosper.'

The wind that blows can never kill
The tree God plants;
It bloweth east, it bloweth west,
The tender leaves have little rest,
But any wind that blows is best.

The tree God plants
Strikes deeper root, grows higher still,
Spreads wider boughs, for God's goodwill
Meets all its wants.

[1] S. Cox, in *The Expositor*, 2nd ser. i. 95.

[2] A. Maclaren, *Sermons Preached in Manchester*, 3rd ser. 232.

[3] H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 55.

[4] J. E. McFadyen, *The Divine Pursuit*, 41.

The Visibility of our Lord's Resurrection Body.

By the Rev. J. M. Shaw, M.A., Logiepert.

I.

That the disciples believed their crucified Lord had appeared to them after His death, not in visional or apparitional, but in real bodily presence, and that to this belief was due as a matter of history the rise of the Christian Gospel and the Christian Church—these are facts now admitted by practically all critics. The validity of this belief, however, is still in some quarters impugned on the ground of the historical untrustworthiness of the evidence for the supposed appearances. The untrustworthinesss alleged is twofold. *First:* The various narratives on examination reveal 'discrepancies' or 'contradictions' in the reports of the appearances. Reimarus, the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, writing nearly a century and a half ago, enumerated ten such irreconcilable 'contradictions'—chiefly in regard to the locality of the appearances. 'In reality,' says a recent critic,[1] 'the number is much greater.' *Second:* Even if the evidence adduced be allowed, it is insufficient. It is not of a kind to satisfy the demands of scientific historical inquiry, inasmuch as the appearances recorded were all vouchsafed to interested parties, namely, to believers.

It is with the latter criticism that this paper is concerned. Let us have before us some representative statements of the objection.

It occurs already in the earliest reasoned criticism of Christianity that has come down to us—the *True Word* of Celsus, written about the end of the second century.[2] 'After these points,' says Origen, taking up Celsus's objections one by one, 'Celsus proceeds to bring against the gospel narratives a charge which is not lightly to be passed over, namely, that if Jesus desired to convince men that He was really divine, He ought to have appeared to those who had ill-treated Him, and to him who had condemned Him, and to men generally.'[3]

[1] Schmiedel in *Ency. Biblica*, iv. col. 4041.

[2] Keim dates it at 177 or 178 A.D.

[3] Origen *Contra Celsum*, ii. 63: Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Κέλσος οὐκ εὐκαταφρονήτως τὰ γεγραμμένα κακολογῶν, φησίν, ὅτι ἐχρῆν, εἴπερ ὄντως θείαν δύναμιν ἐκφῆναι ἤθελεν ὁ Ἰησους αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἐπηρεάσασι καὶ τῷ καταδικάσαντι καὶ ὅλως πᾶσιν ὀφθῆναι.

The objection thus concisely stated by the shrewd pagan philosopher has found frequent expression, under varying forms, in modern times. Two instances may suffice. 'Secure evidence of the resurrection of Jesus,' says Strauss, 'would be the attestation of it in a decided and accordant manner by impartial witnesses. . . . But . . . Jesus showed himself to his adherents only: why not also to his enemies, that they too might be convinced, and that by their testimony posterity might be precluded from every conjecture of a designed fraud on the part of his disciples?'[4]

To like purpose Renan criticizes the N.T. accounts of the appearances as not satisfying 'scientific conditions,' or 'rational principles.' 'None of the miracles (of Evangelic history) took place under scientific conditions,' he says; and forthwith proceeds to state what conditions would satisfy 'scientific,' or 'rational' requirements. 'If to-morrow a thaumaturgus present himself with credentials sufficiently important to be discussed, and announce himself as able, say, to raise the dead; what would be done? A commission, composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons accustomed to historical criticism, would be named. This commission would choose a corpse, would assure itself that the death was real, would select the room in which the experiment should be made, would arrange the whole system of precautions, so as to leave no chance of doubt. If, under such conditions, the resurrection were effected, 'a probability almost equal to certainty would be established'—a probability which would become certainty, 'if the miracle succeeded each time' it was tried.[5]

II.

Now the fact to which these criticisms refer, namely, the restriction of the recorded bodily manifestations of the risen Jesus, is a fact not only supported by the consistent testimony of the Evangelic accounts, but explicitly proclaimed by the Apostles. 'Him,' says Peter, 'God raised on the third day, and gave to become visible (καὶ

[4] Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, Part iii. chap. 4, § 140.

[5] Renan's *Life of Jesus*, Introduction, pp. 29–30 (Trübner).

ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι), not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even unto us who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead' (Ac 10^{40-41}). Was this restriction to believers arbitrary or accidental, or did it result naturally or necessarily from the character of the Lord's risen body? This is the question we wish to ask.

That the risen body was identical or continuous with the body that suffered on the Cross, the Evangelists' accounts bear witness. Apart from the fact of the empty grave, the identity or continuity was evidenced by the print of the nails and the spear mark in the side. It was still a body capable, like the earthly body, of being made tangible and visible (Lk $24^{39.40}$, Jn 20^{20}), and also of partaking of food (Lk 24^{41-43}). But it was the difference or contrast between the two that impressed the disciples most. Indeed, so great was the difference between the *risen* body and the natural that the Lord is represented as with difficulty persuading them of the identity of the two. In the case of the risen body, some at least of the former earthly conditions were transcended. Matter was no longer an obstacle. The risen Christ could pass through a closed sepulchre (implied by Mt 28^{2}), and through shut doors (Jn $20^{19.26}$). He could be present in different and distant places at short intervals (Lk $24^{15.34}$). Suddenly He appears—without apparent physical locomotion,—and as suddenly He disappears (Lk $24^{31.36}$, Jn $20^{19.26}$). As regards the outward appearance, in particular, so utter was the change that, it would seem, the mere external form and features failed to disclose who He was. Mary Magdalene mistook Him for the gardener (Jn $20^{14.15}$). The two men on the way to Emmaus took Him for a stranger, and went on to tell Him what had happened recently in Jerusalem (Lk 24^{16}). And at the Lake of Galilee, when Jesus stood on the beach, the disciples failed to recognize Him. This non-recognition is the more striking when we consider—(1) that, as Orr points out, 'the appearances were not momentary glimpses, but, at least in several of the cases, prolonged interviews';[1] and (2) that even when He appeared to the same people a second or a third time they still at first had their doubts as to His identity (Mt 28^{17}, Lk 24^{36-43}, Jn 19^{24-29} 20^{19-23} 21^{4}).

What was the cause of this inability to recognize the risen Lord on the part of those with whom He had held on earth familiar intercourse?

May it have been, as some have suggested, in the case of Mary, her sudden surprise and bewilderment, combined with the dimness of her tear-bedewed eyes? Did the two men on the way to Emmaus fail to recognize Him because of mental preoccupation with their grief. Again, in the incident at the Lake, may the disciples have been hindered from knowing Him by the distance, or by the dimness of the dawn? It is quite possible that surprise, bewilderment, grief, and such like subjective conditions may have been at work. But the narratives imply that there was something more in the case than this; that there was something in Christ's bodily appearance which prevented recognition, or at least assisted non-recognition. Luke says 'their eyes were holden that they should not know Him' (Lk 24^{16}: οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν). These words of Luke have been taken to imply a special supernatural action on their senses on the part of the risen Christ 'who would not be seen by them till the time when He saw fit.' But the words need not be pressed into conveying such a meaning.[2] They may mean simply that they did not know Him; that there was that about Him which caused them not to recognize Him. And the writer of the Mark appendix explicitly attributes the fact to an objective alteration of His bodily conditions of existence. He appeared to them, he says, 'in another form' (Mk 16^{12}, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ). So great, indeed, was the change in outward form that the sight of Him inspired the eleven disciples with fear. They were 'terrified and affrighted,' and 'supposed that they beheld a spirit' (Lk 24^{37}).

From all which it is evident that, according to the Evangelic narratives, the Resurrection body, whatever it was, was not simply the former natural body 'reanimated' or 'resuscitated' and restored to the former conditions of existence. It was changed and adapted to a new and higher form of existence (ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ). A veritable body it was—no phantasmal or ghostly apparition—the same body, indeed, that was crucified, but now, it would seem, partaking of a more ethereal character, existing, in Origen's words, in a form 'as it were intermediate between the gross corporeality of the body before

[1] *Expositor*, September 1908, p. 248.

[2] See Plummer, in 'International Critical Commentary' on Lk 24^{16}.

the passion and the state of the soul when destitute of such a body.'[1]

III.

In full accord with this representation of the Evangelists is the teaching of Paul in 1 Co 15, which is recognized by all critics to be our oldest and most trustworthy account of the risen Lord's appearances. There a distinction is drawn between the crucified 'psychical' body (σῶμα ψυχικόν), the vehicle of self-manifestation under earthly conditions; and the risen 'pneumatical' or 'spiritual' body (σῶμα πνευματικόν), the fit organ of self-manifestation under supra-terrestrial conditions. Between the two there was identity. Paul's interest in the empty grave implies that. But the identity lay not, as many of the early Church fathers supposed,[2] in any material continuity of particles or organs, or in identity of visible form. 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (v.[50]).[3] The relation between the two is compared by Paul to the relation between the seed, the 'bare grain, and the full-grown blade of corn. The two are so unlike that no one who had seen the former only could conceive of the latter. 'Thou sowest not the body that shall be' (v. [37]). The identity lay rather, as Origen and the Alexandrians maintained, in the continuity or permanence of the 'spirit' or 'germinative principle' which gives the 'law' (λόγος, ratio) of its constitution and moulds or fashions the body so as to make it the fitting vehicle of its manifestation under varying conditions.[4] The 'spiritual' body, that is to say, was a body suited to be a more perfect vehicle and expression of spirit than the earthly material body—'"spiritual," not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly and finally subjugated to spirit and not to the exigencies of physical life.[5] It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose' (Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 127).

Now, if 'spiritual things are spiritually discerned,' may it not reasonably be held that the risen 'spiritual' body of Christ was invisible to the mere natural eye of sense *apart from an inward spiritual susceptibility*? Even if we grant that the visible and tangible manifestations of the risen Christ to the disciples during the forty days were essentially temporary in character—an accommodation to their earthly senses for evidential purposes, in order, that is, to establish the fact of the Resurrection in their doubting minds and thus re-establish their faith, — were not these manifestations in part spiritually conditioned? That His appearance to unbelievers would have served no real purpose, inasmuch as it would have conveyed no proper meaning, we may admit. But is there not ground for going further and maintaining that such an appearance or manifestation was in the nature of the case impossible? When the risen Christ presented Himself bodily to the senses of the disciples, in every instance it would seem they required, in addition to the outward appearance, some more inward personal token or sign before they recognized the presence as that of their risen Lord. Mary recognized Him only after He had awakened former associations within her by naming her in the old familiar tenderness of tone (Jn 20[16]). The two disciples on the way to Emmaus knew not who their fellow-traveller was until something in His manner of taking and breaking the bread recalled past days (Lk 24[31]).[6] And the disciples by the lake were led to recognition of Him only after the repetition of an act which struck a chord in their remembrance, His filling their net with fish (Jn 21[6. 12]).

[1] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 62: . . . ὥσπερεὶ ἐν μεθορίῳ τινὶ τῆς παχύτητος τοῦ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους σώματος καὶ τοῦ γυμνὴν τοιούτου σώματος φαίνεσθαι ψυχήν.

[2] So Tertullian, Jerome, and even Augustine. This is a fact too often unrecognized in modern discussions of the subject. Frequently the case against the Resurrection is argued as if it were merely a question of a dead man returning to life again. So, *e.g.*, Renan *ut sup.*, and more recently Lake (*Historical Evidence for the Resurrection*). The Resurrection of Jesus is a fact of a quite different kind from the revivification of Lazarus. This latter was only a re-entrance on the former physical conditions of existence—a 'resuscitated corpse'—and was destined again to meet death.

[3] 'Flesh *and blood*,' not 'flesh and bones'; cf. Lk 24[39].

[4] See Westcott on 'Origen' in *Dict. of Chr. Biog.* iv. 138, footnote.

[5] The partaking of food by the risen body (Lk 24[41-43]) has been pointed to as irrefragable evidence of a natural physical mode of existence. But the power of eating was no proof of the necessity of eating. The partaking of food was evidential, made to convince the disciples that they were not seeing a ghost; cf. John of Damascus, *De fid. orth.* 4[1], εἰ καὶ ἐγεύσατο βρώσεως μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀλλ' οὐ νόμῳ φυσέως· οὐ γὰρ ἐπείνασεν. The trend of recent science is in the direction of supporting the Pauline view of the 'spiritual body.' See, *e.g.*, Sir Oliver Lodge in *Hibbert*, January 1906, pp. 318 ff.

[6] The suggestion of Paulus and others that it was the marks of the nails in the hands, which became visible in the act of breaking the bread, is without any support in the narratives.

One recorded appearance there is which might seem to militate against this position—the appearance, namely, of the risen Jesus to Paul on the way to Damascus. Paul himself classes this appearance in the same category with the appearances to the other Apostles during the forty days.[1] But Paul at the time of the glorified Christ's appearance to him was still an unbeliever, an enemy of Jesus Christ, and a 'devastator' of the faith (Gal 1^{23}, ἐπόρθει). He was, indeed, on his way to Damascus, there to enter upon a fresh course of 'menace and bloodshed' (Ac 9^{1}, ἐνπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου). Saul the prosecutor, however, had not been without his inward questionings. He had felt the prick of the goad (Ac 26^{14}), though up to the moment of Christ's appearance to him he had steeled his mind and will against it. To his conscience and heart the risen Jesus now by direct supernatural action appealed: 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest' (v.[15]); and it was that inward visitation or appeal which enabled him to recognize in the outward sensible signs the person of the risen Jesus, whose followers he was persecuting, and created in him the lifelong conviction that he had seen the Lord. His fellow-travellers—equally with him—saw the light flash from the sky, and were struck down to the ground by the sight; and when they were risen again to their feet, they also heard the sound which followed. But Paul alone saw the Lord and heard His voice. He alone was capable of having the vision in its fulness. For only in him did the inward combine with the outward, the spiritual with the sensible, to effect a real 'appearance' of the risen Christ.

Is it not a fair inference, then, from the facts adduced, that the body of the risen Christ as 'spiritual' was inaccessible to the senses of all but those possessed of a certain inward spiritual receptiveness? His outward manifestation of Himself, in short, to men, if a revelation on His part was also a discovery on their part. If this can be established, then one thing follows: The restriction to believers of the recorded appearances of the risen Christ, so far from being a ground of objection to the Evangelic narratives—as it has been made from Celsus downwards,—becomes rather an additional corroboration and attestation of their historical trustworthiness.

[1] He uses ὤφθη of both alike. 1 Co 15^{8}, ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων . . . ὤφθη κἀμοί. The word seems to have been current in the Apostolic Church for a personal experience of the appearances of the risen Christ. Twice at least after his conversion Paul believed himself to have seen the Lord, but these later visions he places in a different category from the vision that caused his conversion.

Literature.

THE LAND OF THE HITTITES.

Those who possess Dr. Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*, which was published in 1884, should place beside it Professor Garstang's *Land of the Hittites*, published in 1910 (Constable; 12s. 6d. net). We cannot conceive a better way of showing the advance that has been made within the last five-and-twenty years in our knowledge of the ancient East. Five-and-twenty years hence another book will be written on the Hittites which will show as great an advance in knowledge. For with all that we know about the Hittites, there is much of which we are ignorant; we only know that we are on the eve of more and greater discoveries. But for that we must wait. Meantime we have Professor Garstang's book, which brings our knowledge right up to date. It is a great book. For the subject is a greater one than some have realized yet, and Professor Garstang rises to the height of it. One of our most experienced explorers, he has lately made the Hittites the special field of his exploration. And if his name is not associated with them as is the name of Professor Winckler, we are quite sure that he has written a better book about them than Professor Winckler could have written.

The difference between Dr. Wright and Professor Garstang is due chiefly to the entrance of Asia Minor. Professor Sayce writes an introductory note. In that note he tells us that whereas scientific excavations have long been carried on in Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and Palestine, it is now the turn of Asia Minor, both north and south of the Taurus. And there are indications, he says, that the revelation which Asia Minor and the

neighbouring lands of Syria have in store for us will be even more startling than that which has come from Egypt and Babylonia. There we already knew that great empires and wide-reaching cultures had once flourished; the earlier history of Asia Minor, on the other hand, was a blank. But the blank is beginning to be filled up, and we are learning that there too an empire once existed, which contended on equal terms with those of the Nile and the Euphrates, and possessed a culture that formed a link between the east and the west.

What has hitherto been done to fill up the blank will be found in Professor Garstang's *The Land of the Hittites*, and nothing is spared in the way of excellent illustration to make the book acceptable.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The authorship of the Fourth Gospel is still an open question. We say so after reading an immense volume which has been written by Professor Bacon of Yale against the Johannine authorship. For there is no living scholar, in our judgment, who is more conscientious or more courageous than Professor Bacon, and none who knows the subject better. This, then, is the utmost that can be said against the belief that this Gospel was written by the Apostle John. And it is an open question still. Professor Bacon deals separately with the external and with the internal evidence. His handling of the external evidence is masterly and minute. With the internal evidence he is not so much at home. But whether it is external or internal, there is far too much evidence in favour of the Apostle left unexplained. And above everything else there remains the difficulty of finding an author. The question forces itself on one's mind at every step. How is it possible for a man who could write a book like this, to write it and immediately drop out of sight? If we were reviewing a book in favour of the Johannine authorship, we should lay stress on the difficulties that stand in the way of that belief. For the difficulties are many and great. All we contend for now is that the question of the authorship is still unsolved. And we contend for it after reading with an open mind the strongest book on the negative side that has yet been written in English.

Some of the book has already appeared in the form of articles in magazines. But it is none the worse for that. These articles were part of a complete subject. When brought together they fit into their place without any trouble. For it is long since Professor Bacon had his mind fully made up. He is not one of those who write to clear their own minds or to give themselves courage; he writes always to prove to others the things that are most certainly believed by himself. The title of the book is *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (Fisher Unwin; 15s. net).

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

The Rev. James MacCaffrey, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, is astonished that his *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Gill & Son; 2 vols.) should, within a very few months, have reached a second edition. There is nothing to be astonished at. The nineteenth century covers the career of Wiseman, of Manning, of Newman; it covers the period of the Catholic emancipation and of disestablishment in Ireland; and these persons and things are still of so intense an interest and so far-reaching an influence that a book which gave a complete and unbiassed account of them, even if it contained nothing else, was sure of a widespread welcome. Professor MacCaffrey writes the history of his Church not only in great Britain and Ireland, but throughout the whole world. And he does undoubtedly write it with less prejudice than we should have thought possible in a man who believes so whole-heartedly in its exclusive mission to the world.

To these three things, then, its fairness, its comprehensiveness, and the nearness of the events it describes, may be chiefly attributed the book's success. Professor MacCaffrey is no stylist. He is not always precise in the choice of his words; he has no ear for rhythm. But style is not greatly taken into account now in historical writing. History has become much more a science than an art. So long as the historian verifies his references and arrives at sensible conclusions, his work is readily accepted.

It was inevitable that Ireland should occupy large space in the book. To all but an Irishman, the space will appear out of proportion. But there is this compensation, that if the rest is good, the Irish chapters are supremely good.

The whole production of the book, in spite of

one or two slips in the proof-reading (the most important we have noticed is on p. 54 of vol. ii.), reflects credit on author, printer, and publisher.

THE SIGNS AND SYMBOLS OF PRIMORDIAL MAN.

Mr. Albert Churchward, M.D., M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., F.G.S., P.M., P.Z., believes that all the religious doctrines in the world, and all the symbols that have ever been used to express them, have descended from the ancient Egyptians and the ideas they had of the world to come. He has published a large volume under the title of *The Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man* (Sonnenschein; 25s. net). In that volume, which is plentifully illustrated, the whole earth is ransacked for evidence of the author's thesis. You must not, however, suggest that he formed a thesis first, and then went about to collect the evidence for it. He contends most earnestly that the information contained in his book is right and true, 'the same having been obtained from existing facts, which can be proved by any person devoting his attention to the subject.'

Unfortunately Mr. Churchward has never learned the art of composition. The first paragraph of his introduction occupies four large octavo pages. The first paragraph of the preface is shorter, but it is no better English. Let us quote it.

'In writing the explanation of the Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man, I have gone back to the foundation of the human as a beginning, and traced these signs from the first Pygmies, and their then meaning, up to the latter-day Christians, and shown the evolution and meaning of the same, back to the Primordial Signs and Symbols and Sign Language, which have never been studied or taken into account, so far as I am aware, either in Freemasonry, the Christian doctrines; or the Eschatology of the Egyptians, and without which it is impossible to form a true conception of how these later doctrines came into existence. Without these signs, only a false conception of the ancient Egyptians, their ideas as to the future life, and their belief in the immortality of the soul, could only be erroneous—as indeed we find with most writers on the subject at the present day, their studies and knowledge only going back as far as the Osirian period, which is very recent, comparatively.'

We are not foolhardy enough to criticise the contents of the book. Dr. Churchward wrote a book some time ago on the origin and antiquity of Freemasonry; and some one reviewing it, remarked that a little Egyptian knowledge is a dangerous thing. 'His observation,' retorts Dr. Churchward, 'is true, and most applicable to critics of his *métier*, but does not concern writers who have devoted many years to the study of Egyptology. It would certainly add to the value of the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* if the reviewers learned something first of the subject they attempt to criticise, and did not hazard an opinion on a subject of the alphabet of whose language they are ignorant.'

The misinterpretation of nature has much to do with the difficulty which men of science seem to feel in associating themselves with the Church. And the misinterpretation is not all on one side. The Rev. H. Farquhar, B.D., has written a little book—it is one of the 'Guild Text-Books'—on *The Interpretation of Nature* (Black; 6d. net). He admits frankly and quite cheerfully that the Bible does not contain a scientific interpretation of nature. Its science, he says, is loose and inaccurate and is now superseded. But, on the other hand, he shows that the Bible contains an accurate interpretation of nature, an interpretation that is both poetic and spiritual. That is the interpretation which the man of science is invited to consider. The little book will work wonders in the way of reconciliation if both sides can be induced to read it.

Theodore Parker was at his best in prayer. He could not pray in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is such a pity that he could not. But he held communion with God as Father, a communion which we need not hesitate to say he reached through Jesus Christ, though he did not know or acknowledge it. And in that communion all the strife is forgotten; the gulf of separation is filled up; at one with God, he is at one with us. And so, as it is fitting that in the hundredth year after his birth a new edition of his *Prayers* should be published, it is also very welcome. The edition has been edited by the Rev. Charles Hargrove of Leeds, for the British and Foreign Unitarian Association (1s. net).

What is Christianity? This is the question to which the Rev. N. Macnicol, M.A., has written an answer under the title of *The Religion of Jesus.* The book is intended for the use of missionaries in India, and it is published by the Christian Literature Society for India (1s.). But it will be of service everywhere. Mr. Macnicol, one of the missionaries of the United Free Church of Scotland, is a very competent scholar, and writes with great simplicity.

The new volume of the Revised Version for Schools is *The First Book of the Kings* (Cambridge University Press; 1s. 6d. net). The editor is the Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A., formerly Fellow of Pembroke College. The editor of this series is more careful in selecting his authors than was the original editor of the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools.'

When Professor Andrew Halliday Douglas was Presbyterian minister in Cambridge, he wrote a thesis for the B.A. degree on *The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi.* After many years the thesis has now been edited by his brother —Dr. Charles Douglas—and Dr. R. P. Hardie, and has been published by the Cambridge University Press (7s. 6d. net). Three men, each of exceptional intellectual ability, have given themselves to the making of the book; and, in spite of the limited interest that is now taken in the Schoolmen, it is not at all unlikely that this volume, which describes the last of them, will obtain a considerable circulation. Professor Halliday Douglas saw clearly and wrote clearly. The reader may depend upon it that whatever Pietro Pomponazzi has for this generation will be found in this book. We look upon it, both for its subject and for the treatment of its subject, as a model for all those who have a thesis to write.

It must have been difficult for Mr. Edward Mortimer Chapman to find a title for his book. The title he has chosen, *English Literature and Religion* (Constable; 8s. 6d. net), is not distinctive enough. His purpose is, on the one hand, to set forth the debt which literature owes to religion for its subjects, its language, its antagonisms, and its inspirations; and, on the other hand, to suggest the debt which religion owes to literature for the extension of its influence and the humanizing of its ideals.

It is a large subject. Mr. Chapman has been wise to restrict the range of it. He deals with the writers of the nineteenth century only. He does not, however, plunge us straight into the literature of the nineteenth century. He leads us towards it by two introductory lectures of considerable length. In these lectures, and especially in their treatment of Burns, there is much courageous writing. 'As so often happens in both literature and life, the religious element in Burns shows to best advantage when it is implicit. He hated hypocrisy, and, like many a conscience-smitten man, exalted his hatred into a special virtue. "Holy Willie's Prayer," for instance, is a diatribe acrid enough to have come from the pen of Churchill or of Junius. It is an attack upon ultra-Calvinism in general,—which was sufficiently justifiable; and upon a certain William Fisher in particular,—which nothing could justify. So in the "Holy Fair," with its innuendoes and personalities, there is far less Christian spirit than in the rollicking stanzas of the "Jolly Beggars," a poem which for genuine inspiration must take precedence of the far more famous "Tam o' Shanter." But the "Lines to a Mountain Daisy," to the mouse whose poor home was invaded by his ploughshare, the closing stanzas of his "Address to the Unco Guid," and especially—

A man's a man for a' that

are instinct with the very spirit of the Gospel. Somewhere this man

learned the touch that speeds
Right to the natural heart of things!
Struck rootage down to where Life feeds
At the eternal Springs.'

Whatever this does for Burns, it throws some light upon Mr. Chapman. His manner is never less free and daring throughout the book. He calls Wordsworth and Coleridge the 'sons of the morning,' Carlyle and Ruskin he calls 'Elijah and Elisha.' He is able to appreciate Mr. Thomas Hardy.

The Wesleyan Book Room deserves the thanks of the whole Christian world for the persistent courage of its publications on the social problem. Every other month a new volume appears, and every new volume is instinct with life and earnestness. The latest is *The Social Outlook* (Culley;

1s. net). It contains Papers on Social Problems read at the Second Oxford Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Union for Social Service.

The fortieth Fernley Lecture was delivered by the Rev. Edward J. Brailsford. Where did he go for a subject? He went far away from all the beaten tracks of the Fernley Lecturers. He went to the legendary lore that has gathered round the narratives of the Old and New Testaments. Where he found these legends he does not always say, which is a pity. It would be convenient to have a storehouse of them at hand. But, in truth, he is not so much concerned with the source of the legends as with their meaning. His interest is not literary but devotional, not intellectual but spiritual. Wherever he got them, he quotes them freely, sometimes in the words of his source, and sometimes in his own words, but always for the purpose of bringing out the spiritual meaning underlying them. The title of his book is *The Spiritual Sense in Sacred Legend* (Culley; 3s. 6d.).

Here are two volumes of sermon essays, both published by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls. *Dominion and Power* (5s.), by Mr. Charles Brodie Patterson, is in its seventh edition, so that there is evidently a market for the sermon-essay. No doubt the market is mainly an American one; and indeed the essay which is also a sermon is a peculiar product of modern American life, where the resolution to make the best of both worlds is more determined than it has ever been in the history of this earth. The way to make the best of both worlds is just what the sermon-essay proposes to show. It must be admitted that this world has the lion's share of attention. That perhaps accounts for the success of this form of literature. But at least it is always maintained that character is necessary to true success. And how can character be attained without a background of eternity?

The other volume is called *The Good of Life, and Other Little Essays* (5s.). Among the subjects of the essays are the Dance Question, Outspokenness, the Elusive in Poetry, and Is it right sometimes to Lie? The author of this volume is Professor William Cleaver Wilkinson.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have published another volume of the same kind. But this time it is a translation. It is a translation made by Marian Lindsay from the French of Dora Melegari. The title is *Makers of Sorrow and Makers of Joy* (5s.).

Messrs. Gowans & Gray of Glasgow are the publishers of the 'Pocket Anthologies' (6d. net). No. 7 contains *Characteristic Passages from the Hundred Best Prose-Writers in the English Language.*

That there is a spreading, and rapidly spreading, interest in the study of religion is proved by the number of books on the subject which are pouring from the press. Harper's 'Library of Living Thought' is not necessarily religious; yet of the seventeen volumes now issued eleven are distinctly so. The latest is Professor E. A. Gardner's *Religion and Art in Ancient Greece* (2s. 6d. net). It is a delightful little book. The members of the family to which Professor Gardner belongs have all the gift of style, and they are all scholars. Moreover, this is Professor E. A. Gardner's special subject. There is no one living who knows it more intimately.

Dr. T. Todd-Potts of Gorleston-on-Sea is the publisher of his own poems. The small volume we have seen is entitled *Lays of Faith and Love* (2s. 6d.). It contains a tribute to the memory of King Edward VII., and another to the memory of His Majesty King Oscar of Sweden. But for the most part the theme is human love in one or other of its many manifestations.

The versatility of Professor Flinders Petrie is astounding. When we thought he was digging and deciphering in Egypt, we find he was working out a new solution of the Synoptic problem. His solution of the problem is just as enterprising and original as we should expect it to be. But, after all, there is a connexion between cause and effect. He has reached his solution after looking at the Logia or Sayings of Jesus which have been discovered in Egypt. These Logia are separate fragments. There is the same difference between them and a gospel as there is between a notebook and a treatise. Now, let us suppose that there were a great number of such Logia in existence at the beginning. Suppose, further, that Mark gathered a number of them together, gave them links of connexion and produced a gospel.

Suppose that Matthew and Luke got hold of Mark's collection and added other separate Logia to it, and so made other gospels. Professor Flinders Petrie believes that this, or something like this, is the way in which the present Synoptic Gospels came into existence.

What is the test of his solution? It is that the difference between one Gospel and another is not a difference of words and phrases. It is a difference of episodes; that is to say, of portions containing a narrative or a saying which can stand by itself as a whole. Professor Flinders Petrie has presented his theory with amazing attractiveness in a little volume which he calls *The Growth of the Gospels* (Murray).

Under the curious title of *Old Theology* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. W. H. K. Soames, M.A., has published 'an attempt to expound some of the difficult or obscure or misunderstood texts, passages, and expressions in the New Testament.' Mr. Soames is a keen, earnest evangelical. And he is conscious of it. Much of the exposition is apologetic, but being honest exposition it is all the better for that. One of the passages most fully handled is Jn 3^{3-8}, the passage which deals with the fact and circumstances of the new birth. Mr. Soames draws a sharp distinction between the new birth and conversion. He insists just as sharply that the new birth is not due to baptism. But the passage which receives most attention of all is Mt 26^{26-28}, which begins with the words, 'And as they were eating.' The handling of this passage will be a discovery to those who did not already know that Mr. Soames is one of the best-equipped theologians of our time.

The Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam has taken in hand to publish a series of volumes describing the native tribes for whose welfare it is responsible. The volumes are issued in London by Mr. David Nutt. Already we have received those dealing with the Khasis, the Mikirs, and the Meitheis. The new volume deals with *The Garos*. Its author is Major A. Playfair, I.A. The religion of these tribes, which is the most interesting thing about them, will be described in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Major Playfair devotes forty pages to the religion of the Garos. Speaking of their beliefs about death, he says that in the human body there lives a spirit, which, on being released from its mortal covering, wends its way to Mangru-Mangram, the abode of spirits. Mangru-Mangram, which is now believed to be situated on Chikmang, an isolated peak of the Garo hills, is a kind of purgatory, through which all must pass, good and bad alike. On arriving, the spirit inquires for his relatives, builds his house beside them, and works at the trade he worked at on earth. But Mangru-Mangram is not a place of joy or rest, and the spirit ever hopes for a reincarnation.

The new volume of the R.T.S. Devotional Commentary is *The First Epistle General of St. John* (2s.). The editor is the Rev. G. S. Barrett, D.D. The volume will rank with the best work in the series. Dr. Barrett as an expositor is not easily surpassed. From his volume on the Temptation, published so long ago as 1883, down to this volume, every book he has published has been the outcome of conscientious study and clear thought.

The Semitic series has been enriched by a volume of *Tales and Maxims from the Talmud* (Routledge; 5s. net). The tales and maxims have been selected, arranged, and translated by the Rev. Samuel Rapaport. The book opens with a reprint of Deutsch's famous Essay on the Talmud. And we welcome the reprint. But it is made almost unnecessary by the excellent introduction which Mr. Rapaport himself writes.

Take an example of the precepts: 'Be thou the cursed, not he who curses. Be of them that are persecuted, not of them that persecute. Look at Scripture: there is not a single bird more persecuted than the dove; yet God has chosen her to be offered up on his altar. The bull is hunted by the lion, the sheep by the wolf, the goat by the tiger. And God said, "Bring me a sacrifice, not from them that persecute, but from them that are persecuted."'

Let the example of the tales be a tale of Rabbi Akiba. On his way home one day he met Jonathan, the brother of Dosé, of whom his brother says that he could give a hundred answers to every question he was asked. But he was also fond of asking questions, and when he met Rabbi Akiba he unloaded a host of problems which the famous Rabbi failed to solve. '"Art thou Akiba, the famous Akiba?" asked this

infant terrible. "It is nice to have fame; but in my opinion you do not know enough to be qualified for the position of a herdsman of oxen." So far from being offended by this disparaging remark, the meek Rabbi Akiba added a rider, "Aye, not even as a herdsman of sheep."' So the famous Akiba was the famous Akiba after all.

St. Paul and his Converts is the title which the Rev. Harrington C. Lees gives to a small volume of studies in the Pauline Epistles (Robert Scott; 1s. net). Mr. Lees always finishes his work. This book has more in it than some formal Introductions, though it is so unpretentious.

Psychism, by M. Hume (Walter Scott; 2s. 6d. net), has seven sections. The titles of the sections are Hallucinations, Force, Soul, Fore-knowledge, Sub-conscious Memory, General Sub-conscious Action, and Mysticism. Each section is divided into short paragraphs. Here is a paragraph from the Hallucinations: 'During two years I had a servant who amused me by her habit of saying "Good-morning" and "Good-night" twice over; first with her internal body-voice, not audible to herself, but quite audible to me, and then properly and externally. She was rather scared when at last I told her of it!'

Chronology has a curious fascination for some minds. And Bible Chronology has the additional attraction of a vindication of the accuracy of Holy Scripture. Drawn by this twofold cord, Canon R. B. Girdlestone has published *Outlines of Bible Chronology Illustrated from External Sources* (S.P.C.K.; 2s.).

The Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, lectures on the Thirty-nine Articles. He recommends no text-book. If he is asked what text-book he recommends to his students, he answers the library. But he dictates outlines. And these outlines he has now printed and published, not for the use of his own students only, but for the use and to the great advantage of students and lecturers everywhere. The title is, *Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-nine Articles*, by Arthur J. Tait, B.D. (Stock; 3s. net).

For the encouragement of those who are trying to recover the lost art of pulpit exposition, the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., has published an exposition of the prophet Malachi, which he delivered in lectures on Sunday mornings to the congregations worshipping at the Highgate Congregational Church. The success of the lectures will make the book successful. And others will be encouraged to attempt what he has done so easily and so well. The title of the book is *The Messenger of God* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net).

Mr. F. C. Conybeare has issued a new edition of his *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (Watts; 4s. 6d. net). He himself, however, calls it simply a reprint. He says: 'A few insignificant verbal changes have been made in the text, and such clerical errors corrected as had been noticed by reviewers or detected by myself. Several additions have also been made to the notes at the end of the book.' But there is also a new preface. In that preface Mr. Conybeare replies to Professor Sanday. Professor Sanday reviewed the first edition in a pamphlet which he entitled *A New Marcion*. It is to that pamphlet Mr. Conybeare replies. But it is a disappointing reply. Not a position is seriously defended. Mr. Conybeare simply repeats the not very original statement that there are two Christs, the historical Christ and the Christ of the Church. He expects us to draw the inference that his is the historical Christ.

Christologies Ancient and Modern.

By the Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, D. Phil., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the New College, Edinburgh.

An exposition of Dr. Sanday's 'new and unexplored' theory of our Lord's Person ought, so far as may be, to keep sedulously to the words he himself has chosen, for the matter is one of some preciseness and delicacy. We may perhaps start with this summary statement, which comes at the

end of a lecture on Presuppositions: 'The proper seat or *locus* of all divine indwelling, or divine action upon the human soul, is the subliminal consciousness. And . . . the same, or the corresponding, subliminal consciousness is the proper seat or *locus* of the Deity of the incarnate Christ.' The gist of the new tentative modern Christology is contained in these words.

Nearly five years ago Principal Dykes had with great caution pointed in something very like this direction, and it is remarkable that Dr. Sanday should quite independently have come out at exactly the same spot. 'Our best hope of understanding the dual life of our Lord,' wrote Dr. Dykes, 'may lie in the humble study of our own personal life. There are whole regions of psychical phenomena, little attended to till of late, which betray the existence in the soul of subconscious states and processes of psychic life.' He goes on to give familiar examples of this. Not that the analogy between our personality and that of Christ seems to him either close or satisfying; in the nature of the case that cannot be. But what it does suggest 'is that within the mysterious depths of a single personality, there may co-exist parallel states of spirit life, one only of which emerges in ordinary human consciousness. They may serve to repel the superficial objection that such a dualism is impossible.' Dr. Sanday takes up the same idea in his own way, working it out with a good deal of illustrative detail, and furnishing what I feel may well come to be regarded as the classical interpretation of it. It is a conception at which not a few students of the subject have recently been gazing with a hopeful interest. One of the sanest and most acute thinkers in our ministry wrote to me not long since: 'Dr. Dykes' idea has interested me for some years now—I mean the grounding of the Divine in the subliminal in Jesus. . . . I should not wonder if we need to think ourselves into the subliminal, before we can ever begin to do justice to the conception of it. What if the relation between the subliminal and the supraliminal be the really important question for us? In ideal man there would be a free flow to and fro between the two spheres.' The idea is in the air, and we may take it that thoughtful men are going to look at it undeterred by scorn or misconception.[1]

[1] Cf. an able and lucid chapter in the Rev. N. Macnicol's *Religion of Jesus* (Christian Literature for India, 1910), pp. 53 ff.

Personally I am as yet unconvinced; but this need not, I hope, prevent the inquiry which follows from being a quite impartial one. We have to ask what the objections are which such an hypothesis invites, and whether it is a solution that can permanently be maintained?

In a preliminary way the emphasis of Dr. Sanday's welcome to the idea of the subconscious is striking. In his fine chapter on the subject we cannot help noticing a certain tendency to speak as if it were decidedly more important than the conscious. Thus on p. 145 we read: 'The wonderful thing is that, while the unconscious and subconscious processes are (generally speaking) similar in kind to the conscious, they surpass them in degree. They are subtler, intenser, further-reaching, more penetrating. It is something more than a mere metaphor when we describe the sub- and unconscious states as more "profound."' The work of the Holy Spirit is subliminal; it belongs to the lower sphere. A favourite metaphor with Dr. Sanday to represent the two levels of psychic life is the 'finely poised needle on the face of a dial. The really important thing is not the index, but the weight or the pressure that moves the index. And that, in the case of moral character and religious motive, is out of sight, down in the lowest depths of personality' (p. 158). In the same way he speaks elsewhere of the unconscious 'as containing the key to moral problems.' The general drift of these passages, one feels, is somehow to exalt the subconscious and abysmal at the expense of ordinary consciousness. I am not sure whether Dr. Sanday quite goes all the way with Mr. Myers in regarding the subliminal consciousness as primary and superior—the ordinary mental life being derived from it—rather than its originating source, as psychology has held; but he quotes Mr. Myers without criticism to the effect that 'there exists a more comprehensive consciousness, a profounder faculty . . . from which the consciousness and the faculty of earth-life are *mere selections*.'[2] We shall return to this point; for the present we make a note of it. Whether the subconscious is or is not the source of the conscious, it is at least in Dr. Sanday's view superior to it; and for that reason presumably a worthier receptacle of Deity.

Another introductory conception is that of the *Unio Mystica*. The indwelling of God in the soul

[2] Italics mine.

may be taken as (so to speak) the limiting case of Divine Immanence, and the mystical union so construed is an analogy helping us further to conceive the Incarnation. As Dr. Sanday put it in a former work: 'The Holy Spirit is the bond which binds all humanity together in one. In each one of us He is present after our measure, but in Christ He dwelt as the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' [1] We get some aid from the idea that the human spirit is capable of penetration by the Divine, but still more from combining this second mystical conception with the thought of what we have already called the subliminal. 'The deepest truth of mysticism, and of the states of which we have been speaking as mystical, belongs not so much to the upper region of consciousness—the region of symptoms, manifestations, effects—as to the lower region of the unconscious' (p. 155). Here also we are obliged to ask whether mysticism of the kind undoubtedly present in the New Testament is even congruous, let alone bound up with the idea that the subconscious is a profounder or (in some spiritual sense) more important parallel to ordinary conscious life. Can anything be so important as the conscious and active faith that unites the soul to Christ? One can quite well understand how stress should come to be laid on unconscious process in the interest of a less than ethical theory of the sacraments, but it is just to add that in this volume Dr. Sanday has uttered not one syllable connecting his new hypothesis with ulterior questions of that kind. That there is a buried life of the soul, an 'underworld' or lower region of the unconscious, and that in believers it also is pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, is surely undeniable; but it receives its content and quality, a sound psychology must hold, from what goes on in consciousness, and is itself, as Professor Stout puts it, 'an organized system of conditions which have indeed been formed in and through bygone conscious experience, but which are not themselves present to consciousness.' [2] I grant the difficulty of explaining on these terms how, say, infants can have a real relation to the love of God prior to the wakening of the moral consciousness; but on that subject it seems best to say that *for them* that relation is not such as we are able to interpret; while, on the other hand, our confidence that it is entirely real and redeeming springs from the knowledge of the Divine character which we owe to Christ. What it seems impossible to grant on any terms is that the unconscious is 'higher' than the conscious. True it is that

> 'From the soul's subterranean depths upborne,
> As from an infinitely distant land,
> Come airs and floating echoes';

but, in the first place, these 'murmurs and scents of an infinite sea' are due to traces or dispositions formed in the course of previous conscious experience; secondly, they become significant for us only as they emerge into the upper stream of conscious life. Only then can we assign to them spiritual value. We all of us, for example, are already united in dim, unconscious relation to the whole historic past; but if that relation never came into clear awareness it might just as well be non-existent. Subliminal process, therefore, is the indispensable condition of all mental life; but psychology appears to class it not as the higher reality of the two, but rather as a subordinate and co-operant condition of the 'supraliminal.'

Dr. Sanday's use of the theory for the purposes of Christology is made clear in an important passage which I quote nearly in full. 'We have seen,' he writes, 'what difficulties are involved in the attempt to draw, as it were, a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, and to say that certain actions of His fall on one side of this line, and certain other actions on the other. But these difficulties disappear if, instead of drawing a vertical line, we rather draw a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine. This line is inevitably drawn in the region of the subconscious. . . . Whatever there was of divine in Him, on its way to outward expression whether in speech or act, passed through, and could not but pass through, the restricting and restraining medium of human consciousness. This consciousness was, as it were, the narrow neck through which alone the divine could come to expression.' And he claims that 'the advantage of this way of conceiving of the Person of Christ is that it leaves us free to think of His life on earth as fully and frankly human, without at the same time fixing limits for it which confine it within the measures of the human; it leaves an opening,

[1] *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 310.
[2] *Hibbert Journal*, October 1903, p. 47.

which in any case must be left, by which the Deity of the Incarnate preserves its continuity with the infinitude of Godhead' (pp. 165–166).

Points to be carefully noted here are these. Dr. Sanday would lay a good deal of emphasis on the figure of 'the narrow neck' as applied to our Lord's human consciousness. In other words, the expression is human, completely human; but that which is expressed is neither human alone nor divine alone, but divine and human fused or blended. It is a mistake, that is, to equate the Divine and the unconscious; but the unconscious is at any rate the region in which the divine and the human merge in each other, and the divine so entering and mingling with our nature is continuous with the infinite Godhead. It is thus a cardinal point with the new theory to maintain that the influence of the one upon the other takes place below the point or line at which the resultant consciousness comes to expression. And if it be asked what ground we have for believing that there was in Christ 'a root of being striking down below the strata of consciousness, by virtue of which He was more than human,' Dr. Sanday in reply would simply indicate 'the marks which have been appealed to all down the centuries in proof that in Him Deity and humanity were combined' (p. 174).

Such, then, are the new suggestions of the book towards the Christological theory, and it is very possible that it may form a subject of no little discussion in the immediate future. The majority of readers will probably feel that the theory is in itself attractive, and I need scarcely add that the statement of it is a finely conceived piece of argumentative exposition. Dr. Sanday puts the hypothesis at its best and strongest. All will sympathize with his vital interest in the unity and consistency of Jesus' life, and with his unreserved acceptance of the position that 'there is no possible or desirable division between what is human in Him and what is divine.' How seriously this is meant comes out in a few pages, near the close, on the working of our Lord's consciousness, which I take leave to say belong to the very best that has been written on the subject, and ought to be read and re-read by every student. Had the book contained nothing more than the reasoned explication of this passage, it would have added greatly to our insight. Dr. Sanday has at least made it still clearer than before that the strict Two-Nature doctrine is not the last word upon the subject, whether we do or do not accept the particular hypothesis he has put forward of the subliminal consciousness of Christ as the region where His Deity may be localized.

Now, in regard to this theory, as set forth in the passages just quoted, one cannot but feel the pressure of certain initial difficulties which it may be as well to express frankly.

(*a*) The superiority of the unconscious. I have already touched on this point, but we may recur to it. It seems to be an essential premise of the theory, but is it as a fact really tenable? It is hard for many of us to get over the objection that the subconscious has as such no moral character at all; and that out of it there well up all sorts of things, not only impulses which we are entitled to regard as divine, but also, as Dr. Sanday himself concedes, the really diabolical. From that region, it appears, derive not only the intuitions of genius and poetry, but the disordered and incoherent absurdities of dreams. If we are straitly charged to define the subconscious, indeed, we have to confess that we know nothing of it whatever save as process beneath the threshold of consciousness which indifferently co-operates in *all* mental construction, be the product of such construction from the ethical point of view good or bad. And the question at once arises: Are we justified in taking this half-lit region of psychic life, as to which our information is so largely a matter of hypothesis and inference,—it is, as Dr. Sanday admits, that part of the living self which is most beyond our ken,—and decide that *there* is the seat and dwelling-place of Deity; that there *par excellence* is a receptacle specially suited and adapted for the presence of God in man? Some people would maintain, I fancy, that the subliminal is that in us which approximates most nearly to the mysterious faculty or aptitude which we call instinct, and that it is for that reason akin rather to the animal than to the divine; and such arguments would require very grave consideration. At all events, Professor James seems hardly entitled to affirm that the subconscious is continuous—if by this he means homogeneous—with our conscious life; even if it be a *part* of a self, it is not therefore a self *suo jure*, but at most machinery subservient to the rational and ethical life of the Ego; and we cannot acknowledge that what belongs rather to the natural conditions out of which self-consciousness rises can be superior in worth or (so to speak)

spiritual status to self-consciousness proper. Or, to put it otherwise, 'the subliminal' is a form embracing a very dimly known content those changes or processes below the threshold of consciousness which we see are required to explain what goes on in normal mental life; have we any right to take that form, abstracted from the only content known to be associated with it, and assign to it the very different content of Deity? How do we really know that the form and the content are now adapted or suited to each other, that the content *fits* the form?

(*b*) Is the drift of the theory not inevitably towards the older conception of Deity as essentially unknowable? I am speaking, of course, merely of the implicit logic of the theory as a whole. That dim sphere of mental life which we name the 'subliminal,' and which we find it practically impossible to describe in genuinely positive terms, is taken to be the dwelling-place of Godhead; of Godhead, too, as coming so near to manhood as to be conjoined with it in a single life. God is so close to us; yet, on second thoughts, so far away! For to the Christian mind God is love; and love is above all things conscious, ethical, rational. It is something that I find it quite impossible to translate into terms of the subconscious. We know what is meant by saying that the love that looked out of Christ's eyes, touching men's lives and making all things new for them, was the very personal love of God Himself, present by a vast act of sacrifice in a human personality; and there need be no hesitation in admitting that by this entrance into earthly experience the Son of God submitted to restraints and disabilities of self-expression; 'the condition which He was assuming,' as Dr. Sanday puts it, 'permitted only degrees of self-manifestation.' But how shall we construe to ourselves a Holy Love—a love identical with the very essence of Deity, making God indeed to be God—which yet resides in the unconscious? For we must not be misled by the term 'subliminal *consciousness*' into thinking that the subconscious is really another kind or form of the conscious—a second self working (as it were) behind the curtain. Mr. Myers notoriously was tempted off into various exaggerations and inaccuracies of this kind, which led one of his critics to say that his theory had much affinity with 'such conceptions as that of a tutelary genius or guardian angel.' In reality, of course, the subconscious is so far just the *un*conscious; and my difficulty in that case precisely is that the nature of the unconscious is indescribable by us in ethical or spiritual terms. Our Lord's life, we are told, is entirely human on the *surface* (p. 213); but there was beneath it a presence of Deity one in kind with that of God who rules the universe (p. 209). Yet since we are unable to characterize that Deity by epithets drawn from the human surface—love, holiness, wisdom, etc., all of them conscious attitudes or activities of mind—then, so far as I can see, it becomes for us simply the unknown and unknowable.

(*c*) I come now to what may be regarded as the gravest difficulty of all, I mean from the point of view of theory. Does the new hypothesis really help us to rise above the haunting dualism of tradition? I have already quoted a passage in which Dr. Sanday proposes that instead of a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, we should rather draw 'a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine.' And we have to keep in view the phrases just noted as to the human surface and the divine depths beneath it. Now it is far from clear how these expressions are to be harmonized with the fundamental principle with which, like many of the best recent writers, Dr. Sanday operates, that to the believing study of our Lord's Person all that is divine in Him is human, all that is human is divine. Dr. Sanday will reply to this, I imagine, that the line in question 'is inevitably drawn *in the region of the subconscious*' (p. 166),[1] so that it is out of a subliminal whole in which the fusion of divine and human has already taken place that the resultant states of full consciousness actually rise. This, however, does not appear to me to get rid of the fact that, *ex hypothesi*, the consciousness is human only, so that to reach the divine in Jesus you have still to leave the specifically human behind. We still argue *from* the one *to* the other, instead of envisaging them as merged in a single divine-human consciousness. And more and more one's clear feeling is that if Godhead and manhood are one in Jesus—and faith is certain that they are—they must be both present everywhere in each part and region of His experience; with no

[1] Italics mine.

line, that is, between them of any kind which could obscure the vital fact that the character of God, which is ethical through and through, is actually being revealed in our human conditions.

But while I feel these objections strongly, and do not so far see how they are to be answered, I cannot think that it is just to reproach Dr. Sanday with saying no more about Christ than can be said of every man, simply because in every man humanity rests on a subliminal consciousness which is continuous with Deity. For one thing, an objection of this sort would hold equally against all theories of a real Incarnation, in so far as Incarnation *eo ipso* implies a congruity or kinship between God and man which renders their union possible; and Dr. Sanday does no more than give a special explanation of where, in his opinion, this congruity or meeting-point lies. God and man, he holds, are united in the subliminal region, and there it is that they were uniquely made one in Jesus. He may be wrong in much that he teaches as to the subliminal; so far I cannot myself see that he is always right; but at all events nothing in his theory is at all inconsistent with full adhesion to Christian belief in the divine uniqueness of Jesus. And for another thing, there is that in Jesus, on Dr. Sanday's own showing, the antecedents and origin of which mark Him off from all other children of men. The Deity that has its seat in the profounder consciousness of Jesus is defined as being an Incarnation of the Son, it is Deity 'one in kind with that of God who rules the universe.'

With the motives that animate Dr. Sanday's new theory and have guided him in its construction there is sure to be wide sympathy, a sympathy which it is to be hoped will take shape in frank and searching criticism from both sides. The subject is a fascinating one, and perhaps there are many to whom the new conception will be none the less attractive that in a modified form it may prove to be compatible with, or even introductory to, a modern reading of Kenoticism. Everything is of value that helps us to transcend the Two-Nature theory as handed on from the past, or that stimulates us to ask afresh how we can think of God as expressing Himself under the limitations of a human consciousness. It is no slight service to have these issues canvassed anew by a thinker of Dr. Sanday's independent power and thoroughness. And while I have felt bound to give unreserved expression to difficulties that occur on a first reading, I am conscious at the same time that his exposition has placed the central conception in a new light, and that we are no longer at liberty simply to put it aside as unfertile. Whether we do or do not assent to his special philosophy of the transcendent element in our Lord, at least he has deepened our feeling for the mystery of personality, and it cannot be seriously questioned that this is the first essential for a Christology that is to win or satisfy the modern mind.

In the Study.

Freely.

I.

The Use of the Word.

THIS word is used in the English Bible in three ways. It means—

1. *Without restraint.*

S. Augustine's *Manuell*, 1577 (Pickering's ed., p. 20): 'Happy is the soule whiche being let loose from the earthly prison, flieth up freely into heauen, and there beholdeth thee her most sweete Lord face to face.'

Gn 2^{16}—'Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat.'

Ad. Est. 16^{10}—'The Jews may live freely after their own laws.'

Ac 2^{29}—'Let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David.' The Greek here is μετὰ παρρησίας, lit. 'with boldness of speech.'

Ac 26^{26}—'Before whom also I speak freely.' The Greek is παρρησιαζόμενος λαλῶ: the same Greek participle is translated in 9^{28} 'preaching boldly.'

Jn 2^{10} R.V.—'When men have drunk freely' This translation of the R.V. is a compromise

between the translation of the A.V., 'when men have well drunk' (which comes from the Geneva Bible, and is used also in the Bishops' and the Rhemish Versions), and the literal translation, 'when men are drunken' (cf. Lk 12^{45}), which is used by Tindale, followed by Coverdale, Rogers, and the Great Bible (cf. Vulg. *cum inebriati fuerint*).

2. *Of free will, voluntarily.*

Milton, *Paradise Lost*, v. 538—

> Freely we serve
> Because we freely love.

Ps 54^{6}—'I will freely sacrifice unto thee'—lit. 'with voluntariness'; but as the same word is used for a freewill offering, R.V. translates, 'With a freewill offering will I sacrifice unto thee.'

Hos 14^{4}—'I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely.' Some of the translations here are interesting. The Vulg. has *spontanee*, the Wyclifite Version of 1382 'of my free will,' but 1388, 'wilfuli'; Rogers, 'wyth al my heart'; Douay, 'voluntarily.' 'Freely' comes from the Geneva Version. The Hebrew is simply the word 'voluntariness' (*nedhabhah*): it is the same word that is translated 'willing' in Ps 110^{3}, lit. 'Thy people will be (all) voluntariness in the day of thy host' (*i.e.* be ready to volunteer for service).

In the Geneva Version (of Lk 1^{28}) the participle κεχαριτωμένη is translated 'Hail thou that art *freely beloved*.' Upon which there is an angry note in the Rhemish Version. There the translation is 'full of grace,' which is Wyclif's and Tindale's. 'Note,' say the translators, 'the excellent prerogatiues of our B. Lady, and abhorre those Heretikes which make her no better than other vulgar women, and therfore to take from her fulnes of grace, they say here, "Haile freely beloued," contrarie to al significations of the Greeke worde, which is at the lest, "endued with grace," as S. Paul vseth it Ephes 1 by S. Chrysostom's interpretation: or rather, "ful of grace," as both Greek and Latin fathers haue alwaies here vnderstood it, and the Latines also read it, namely, S. Ambrose, thus, "Wel is she only called ful of grace, who only obteined the grace, which no other woman deserued, to be replenished with the author of grace."'

3. *For nothing, gratuitously.*

Wyclif (1388), Ex 21^{11}, 'sche schal go out freli (1382, frelich) without money.'

Coverdale (1535), Is 52^{5}, 'my people is frely caried awaye,' where A.V. and R.V. have 'my people is taken away for nought.'

The usual word in the N.T. is δωρεάν, which is the accus. of the word δωρεά meaning 'a gift' used adverbially. This is so in Mt 10^{8}, Ro 3^{24}, 2 Co 11^{7}, Rev 21^{6} 22^{17}. In Ro 8^{32} and 1 Co 2^{12} it is the verb χαρίζομαι which is translated 'freely give.' But the meaning is the same, 'without money and without price.'

In the *Judgment of the Synod of Dort*, we read, 'Faith in Jesus Christ, and saluation through him is the free gift of God, as it is written, Eph 2^{8}, "By grace yee are saued, through faith, and that not of your selues, it is the gift of God"'; in like manner, Phil 1^{29}, 'Vnto you it is (freely) giuen to beleeue in Christ.'

II.

The Chief Texts.

The chief texts are Hos 14^{4}, Ro 3^{24}, Rev 21^{6} with 22^{17}, Ro 8^{32}, Mt 10^{8}.

Hos 14^{4}—'I will love them freely.' This text is the beginning. It must be the beginning, for it is the beginning of everything. From the love of God comes life, with all that life brings us. From the love of God comes death, and the resurrection from the dead, and life everlasting. From the love of God comes our appreciation of all these things, our appreciation of the Giver of them. We love because He first loved us.

This sentence, says Spurgeon,[1] is a body of divinity in miniature. He who understands its meaning is a theologian, and he who can dive into its fulness is a true Master in divinity. 'I will love them freely,' is a condensation of the glorious message of salvation which was delivered to us in Christ Jesus our Redeemer. The sense hinges upon the word 'freely.' 'I will love them *freely*.' Here is the glorious, the suitable, the divine way by which love streams from heaven to earth. It is, indeed, the only way in which God can love such as we are. It may be that He can love angels because of their goodness; but He could not love *us* for that reason; the only manner in which love can come from God to fallen creatures is expressed in the word 'freely.' Here we have spontaneous love flowing forth to those who neither deserved it, purchased it, nor sought after it.

Ro 3^{24}—'Being justified freely by his grace.' This is the love of God in action—the free, spontaneous, undeserved, unasked love of God, acting upon us so lovingly that through Christ we are declared to be no longer enemies, but fellow-citizens with

[1] *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, No. 501, p. 169.

the saints. Being justified, we love, because He first loved us; and we love one another according to the measure of His love to us in Christ—if not yet in actual fact, at least in prospect, the way being now made open. And this active exercise of His love in our justification is as undeserved as His original gift of love.

Matthew Henry very properly emphasizes the word 'freely.' 'The apostle says that the justification is "freely by his grace" to show that it must be understood of grace in the most proper and genuine sense. It is said that Joseph found grace in the sight of his master (Gn 39[4]), but there was a reason; he saw that what he did prospered. There was something in Joseph to invite that grace; but the grace of God communicated to us comes freely, freely; it is free grace, mere mercy; nothing in us to deserve such favours; no, it is all "through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." It comes freely to us, but Christ bought it, and paid dear for it, which yet is so ordered as not to derogate from the honour of free grace. Christ's purchase is no bar to the freeness of God's grace; for grace provided and accepted this vicarious satisfaction.'

Rev 21[6].—'I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely.' Being justified freely by His grace we have entered upon the journey of life, the journey which ends in that city which hath foundations. But every step of the way we receive freely of His grace. And the grace which is given us is well symbolized by a fountain of the water of life. For every step of the way we are thirsty, and at every step our thirst is quenched in Him. The first step first, of course.

I heard the voice of Jesus say,
'Behold, I freely give
The living water; thirsty one,
Stoop down and drink, and live':
I came to Jesus, and I drank
Of that life-giving stream;
My thirst was quenched, my soul revived,
And now I live in Him.

But also every following step. And these steps are (1) pardon, (2) purity, (3) peace, (4) presence, and then no more thirst.

Over the silver mountains,
Where spring the nectar fountains,
There will I kiss
The bowls of bliss,
And drink mine everlasting fill
From every milken rill;
My soul will be a-dry before,
But after that will thirst no more.

God issues many invitations of the freest kind. I will only quote one out of very many. Turn to the first verse of the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.' Grace must be gratis; the word 'freely' in our text makes it clear that salvation is an absolute gift, but here the fact is put in a negative form that there may be no mistake whatever. Mercy is 'without money and without price'—without price in any possible sense. We neither purchase, nor procure, nor earn, nor produce salvation by merit, effort, sacrifice, or service. It comes to us, not because we deserve it, but because we need it. We are blessed with it out of the goodwill and pleasure of the Lord, and we do not purchase it by good deeds, good desires, or pious resolves, or persevering endeavours. We are empty and He fills us. In order that you may come to Jesus, no preparation is required. You may come just as you are, and come at once: only confess that you need Him, desire to have Him, and then take Him by trusting Him. He is like wine and milk, supplying delight and satisfaction, and you are to take Him as men would take a drink. How could the invitation be put more broadly than it is? How could it be uttered more earnestly? It has a 'Ho!' to give it tongue. Tradesmen in certain parts of London stand outside of their shops and cry 'Buy, buy!' or call out Ho!' to the passers-by because they are anxious to sell their wares. Jesus is yet more eager to distribute His rich grace, for He longs to see men saved. Ho! ye that pass by, stop here awhile: turn your attention this way: here is something worthy of your thoughts. 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money.'[1]

Ro 8[32].—'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?' This is not the gift of the water of life in other language. The water of life signifies that we freely receive all things that are necessary to quench our thirst. But now we see that when we receive Christ we receive many things of the need of which we were before quite unconscious, and of the value of which we were quite ignorant. All things are ours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas, or the world or life or death, or things present or things to come. The range of our possessions vastly exceeds our sense of need. He gives us what we need freely, and as we need it; but just as freely He gives us innumerable things which we do not know we need. Nor is there any occasion for incredulity. For in comparison with the gift of Christ, all other things, if we could separate them from Him, would be of little account. But it is with Christ we receive them. To receive Him is to receive them all.

[1] C. H. Spurgeon, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, No. 1549, p. 415.

All things in Christ are *freely* for all. 'Shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?' It is not God's way to sell His glorious things. It is not His way in nature. The vital things of nature, the manifold riches of sea and shore, of earth and sky, are free gifts. We often reason as if we had paid handsomely for all things, and then grumble as if we had got short measure; but it is the greatest possible blunder. If we reject free gifts, we must send back every beam of the sun, every drop of rain and flake of snow, every green leaf, every spray of blossom, every purple cluster, every golden sheaf. Neither does God sell His glorious gifts of intellect. There was no king's ransom ready in the house where Shakespeare was born. All may see that Heaven does not dispense its most splendid talents where wealth is, or greatness; the immortal painter, singer, or inventor is born in attic, cellar, or cottage into which no other royalty ever looked. And God does not sell anything that belongs to the realm of the soul. The principle of barter has no place in the highest world. If we thought to purchase the noblest things with silver or gold, with gifts or sacrifices, we are sternly reproved: 'Thy money,' thy goods, thy goodness, 'perish with thee.' And as it is not God's way to sell His glorious things to pride and greatness, we certainly have no ability to buy them. All is, must be, free.[1]

Mt 10[8]—'Freely ye received, freely give. The words were spoken to the Twelve when He sent them out to preach. He sends us all out to preach, if we interpret the mission broadly enough. He Himself gave it a broad interpretation to the disciples: 'As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand; heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils; freely ye received, freely give.' Their orders were, in short, to give everything that they had to give. But special emphasis is laid on the manner of giving. It is to be without thought of return. The disciples are to begin the giving as God began the loving; and they are to continue it with as little regard to the worthiness of the recipients. Moreover, they are to hope for nothing again except the one thing, love; and even that, not love to them, but love to God.

Once when I was a schoolboy going home for the holidays, I had a long way to go to reach the far-away little town in which I dwelt. I arrived at Bristol, and got on board the steamer with just money enough to pay my fare, and that being settled, I thought in my innocence I had paid for everything I needed in the way of meals. I had what I wanted so long as we were in smooth water; then came the rough Atlantic, and the need of nothing more. I had been lying in my berth for hours, wretchedly ill, and past caring for anything, when there came the steward and stood beside me.

'Your bill, sir,' said he, holding out the piece of paper.

'I've got no money,' said I in my wretchedness.

'Then I shall keep your luggage. What is your name and address?'

I told him. Instantly he took off the cap he wore, with the gilt-band about it, and held out his hand: 'I should like to shake hands with you,' he said, with a smile.

I gave him my hand, and shook his as well as I could. Then came the explanation—how that some years before some little kindness had been shown his mother by my father in the sorrow of her widowhood. 'I never thought the chance would come for me to repay it,' said he pleasantly; 'but I am glad it has.'

'So am I,' said I.

As soon as I got ashore I told my father what had happened. 'Ah,' said he, 'see how a bit of kindness lives! Now he has passed it on to you. Remember, if ever you meet anybody that needs a friendly hand, you must pass it on to them.'

Years had gone by. I had grown up and quite forgotten it all, until one day I had gone to the station of one of our main lines. I was just going to take my ticket when I saw a little lad crying—a thorough man he was, trying bravely to keep back the troublesome tears, as he pleaded with the booking-clerk.

'What is the matter, my lad?' I asked.

'If you please, sir, I haven't money enough to pay my fare. I have all I want but a few pence, and I tell the clerk if he will trust me I will be sure to pay him again.'

Instantly back upon me flashed the forgotten story of long ago. Here, then, was my chance of passing it on. I gave him the sum he needed, and got into the carriage with him. Then I told the little fellow the story of long ago, and of the steward's kindness to me. 'Now, to-day,' I said, 'I pass it on to you; and remember if you meet with any one that needs a kindly hand, you must pass it on to them.'

'I will, sir,' cried the lad, as he took my hand, and his eyes flashed with earnestness.

'I am sure you will,' I answered.

I reached my destination, and left my little friend. The last sign I had of him was as the handkerchief fluttered from the window of the carriage, as if to say: 'It is all right, sir; I will pass it on.'[2]

Virginibus Puerisque.

Happiness.

There are twenty-six letters in the English alphabet, and the Rev. S. P. Bevan has published twenty-six *Talks to Girls and Boys* (Griffiths; 2s. 6d. net). The first talk is on Angels, the second on Bells, the third on Conscience, and so on, till the alphabet is ended. H is for Happiness. This is Mr. Bevan's talk on Happiness:

What is Happiness?

A Yorkshire man said that there is happiness in 'Having a little bit more than you've got.' Here

[1] W. L. Watkinson, *Studies in Christian Character*, 2nd ser. 11.

[2] M. G. Pearse, *Some Aspects of the Blessed Life*, 161.

is a description of Happiness that won a prize: 'Happiness is wanting nothing and knowing it.' For ourselves we will say: Happiness is health of heart.

The first division of our little sermon shall be:

(*a*) *Happiness is inside of you.*

'Oh!' a boy says, 'how glad I should be, how happy, if father would buy me a cricket bat—one with a proper cane-splice.' 'Oh!' another says, 'I should be happy if my father would buy me a watch. All for my own.' 'Yes,' a girl says, 'if I could only have a pair of boots like those in that shop, or a ribbon like Lucy's, I should be quite happy.' Don't, don't grow up with the idea that happiness is in the things you can buy for your own. A man who had three millions every year was not happy, and a famous German who had many beautiful things and was very clever, said that in all his seventy-five years he had not had one month of true happiness.

Can you learn these lines:

> In your hearts are the birds and the sunshine,
> In your thoughts the brooklets flow.

Happiness is inside of you.

The second division is:

(*b*) *To keep happiness you must give it away.*

'Oh no! that can't be right'—yes—it is. Byron said that happiness was born a twin—by which he meant that if you would keep happiness you must halve it.

Once upon a time there lived a king, who had one son. This boy had everything he wished for—toys of many kinds—a fine yacht to steam round the palace lake—a pony (my!—wouldn't you like to have a pony?), and I don't know what besides, and yet he was unhappy. With sad eyes he used to wander about the palace and the park. The king—his father—was troubled, and went to see a wise old man, and said, 'Can you tell me how it is that my son is not happy? I buy him all he wants: he has friends, toys, a yacht, a pony, and yet he is miserable.'

The wise old man took a piece of paper and wrote on it, with something that looked like water. Folding the paper he gave it to the king, saying, 'At eight o'clock to-night, when it will be dark, take a lighted candle and hold this paper between the light and your eyes, and you will then read what I have written, in ink that looked like water.' Evening came, and, in a large room of the palace, the king held the paper before a lighted candle. Out upon the paper there came, clearly, these words, 'The secret of happiness is to do a little kindness to someone every day.' If you would keep happiness you must give it away.

'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' That is the text.

On Maps of Palestine containing Ancient Sites.

By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford.

II.

Jazer (Is 16[8])—properly *Ya'zer*—is mentioned several times besides in the Old Testament; but not in such a way as to fix its site precisely. It belonged to Gad (Nu 32[35], Jos 13[25],[1] 2 S 24[5 2]), and was on the border of the Ammonites (Nu 21[24],—at least if, as is probable, *Ya'zer* (יעזר) should be read for *strong* (עז); see Gray, *Numbers*, p. 297).

[1] Where 'their border was,' means 'their territory included.'

[2] Read with LXX 'began from' for 'pitched in'; and render then, with RVm, 'toward' for the ungrammatical 'of.'

The map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, follow the P.E.F. map, mentioned in the last article, in placing Jazer about 16 miles E.N.E. of the N.E. corner of the Dead Sea, a little N.E. of el-'Al (Ele'aleh, Is 16[9]); G. A. Smith does not venture to locate it. Why is Jazer placed so confidently here? The *Survey of E. Palestine* (p. 91) will inform us. Simply because there is a place there called 'Beit-*zera*'; and the consonants in *zera'* are the same as three of those in Ya'zer, only 'transposed,' as in other cases, so as to give a modern meaning

to the word.' The reason is hardly more satisfactory than that for the identification of Heisa with Luḥith. Eusebius, indeed, tells us (264. 98–265. 5) that Yazer was a town, 10 or (212. 27) 8 Roman miles W. of Philadelphia (Rabbath Ammon, now *ʿAmmān*), and 15 R. miles from Heshbon: a large stream, he adds, rose from it, and fell into the Jordan. These distances would point to a place, a little W. of Ajbêhât (the ancient Jogbehah), in the W. Ezrak (see G. A. Smith's map), some 14 miles N. of Beit-zeraʿ. The *Onomasticon*, however, 'is not a safe guide': but there ought surely to be better grounds for rejecting its testimony than those alleged in the present instance. It is true, however, that Eusebius' statement does occasion some difficulty. There does not seem to be in W. Ezrak, at least so far as it has been explored, any ruins or modern place that would satisfy Eusebius' description. Hence Merrill and others[1] have identified Yaʿzer with Ṣār,—to judge from the ruins, a place anciently of some importance,—7 miles W. of ʿAmmān, and 10 miles due N. of Heshbon (see Smith's map; and a description in Merrill's art. JAZER in *D.B.*). Ṣār stands on a hill: in the valley below, about 1 mile to the N.W., is the spring ʿAin eṣ-Ṣir, the waters of which combine with those of a number of streams flowing down from the N. and N.W. to form the Wâdy Ṣir, which runs down through a well-watered, beautifully wooded valley to the S.W.; on the S. of Ṣār, other streams arise to form the Wâdy esh-Shîta, which, also flowing down to the S.W., soon becomes the Wâdy Bahhath: this, before long, unites with W. Ṣir to form W. Kefrein, a large stream which ultimately falls into the Jordan, about 2 miles N. of the Dead Sea.[2] The distances of Ṣār from ʿAmmān and Heshbon are not much less than those given by Eusebius for Jaʿzer; and one of the streams just described might be very fairly identified with the one mentioned by him: but, as already pointed out in the *Survey* (p. 153 f.), the names *Ṣār* and Yaʿzer can have no connexion; and the phonetic differences between them constitute a fatal objection to their identification.[3]

[1] The identification, I believe, was first proposed by Seetzen, *Reisen*, 1854, i. 398 (either Ṣir, or Kh. eṣ-Ṣireh, above ʿAin eṣ-Ṣir, to the N.W.).

[2] See, for the particulars, Merrill, *East of Jordan*, pp. 405–7; the P.E.F. *Survey of E. Palestine*, p. 153, with the map in the pocket; and Guy Le Strange, in Schumacher's *Across the Jordan*, p. 311, 312.

[3] Kampffmeyer (*Z.D.P.V.* xv. (1892), 24; cf. xvi. 43, referred to by Buhl), in one of his interesting and scholarly articles on the ancient place-names of Palestine, compared phonetically with their modern equivalents, says that he has in his collections no instance of the change of ז into ص, except in the equally uncertain case of the suggested identification of *Muraṣṣaṣ* with Meroz. (Ewing, in accepting this in *D.B.*, *s.v.*, is obviously unconscious of any phonetic difficulty; Moore's objections are thus better 'justified' than he imagines.)

Still, as Dr. Gray remarks (*Numbers*, p. 298), the '*site* of Ṣār does tolerably suit the data of Eusebius'; if, therefore, it is adopted provisionally,—pending a more thorough exploration of W. Ezrak,—it must be clearly understood that the identification is *conjectural*, and that it is made, not *because of* the resemblance of 'Ṣār' to 'Yaʿzer,' but *in spite of* there being no real connexion between them. It ought thus in no case to be marked on a map without a (?). Laurence Oliphant, in his *Land of Gilead*, 1880 (p. 233), observing that Jajuz, the name of a place 5 miles N. of ʿAmmān, 'seems to have a certain similarity (!) with Jazer,' proposes this as its site. But this identification has nothing to recommend it. It is true, there appear to be a spring and stream sufficiently near to satisfy Eusebius' statements: but the stream flows, not into the Jordan, but into the Jabbok; the distances are altogether different from those given by Eusebius, and the name resembles Jaʿzer as little as Ṣār does. Indeed, Oliphant himself thinks that if it will not do for Jaʿzer, it will at least suit Jahaz! But we cannot identify two names merely because they both begin with *Ja* and have a *z* in them.

Let us now take some examples from the other side of Jordan. Let us suppose that the intelligent reader desires to find the places assigned in Jos 15^{33-36} to the *shephēlah*, or 'lowland,' of Judah; and let us see what help his maps give him.

1 and 2. 'Eshtā'ōl and Ẓorʿah. The name Ẓorʿah is still preserved in *Ẓurʿa*, a place 14 miles due W. of Jerusalem: so there is no difficulty about its site. Eshta'ol is often mentioned beside it in the history of Samson; and though *'Eshuaʿ*, the name of a place about a mile N.E. of it, is 'far in sound from אשתאול' (G. A. Smith, *H.G.* 218 *n.*), yet the situation suits. Still, one certainly wishes that the 'tradition' that the place was once called *'Eshu'al* or *'Eshtu'al* (Smith, 219; Buhl, 195) could be confirmed. The site is accepted in *H.G.* 218 only with 'perhaps.'

3. 'Ashnah. In the P.E.F. map, mentioned

above, marked with a (?) at the village of Ḥasan, about a mile N. of Ẓor'ah. In G. A. Smith's map (both the one of Judah in *H.G.*, and the large map), the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, placed at Ḥasan *without* a (?).

But according to the article in *D.B.* (Conder), *E.B.*, and Steuernagel, in his Comm. on Jos. (1900), unidentified; and by G. A. Smith, *H.G.* 202 *n.* 1, included (implicitly) among the sites 'not properly identified.' And when we learn (P.E.F. *Name-Lists*, p. 305) that 'Ḥasan' commemorates the name of an Arab pilgrim, it dawns upon us that Smith's statement is not in excess of the truth.

In the case of this place, there are thus two contradictions, each in one and the same book: in both *H.G.* and *D.B.* the map marks it, without any indication of uncertainty; the text says that the site is unknown!

4. Zanoaḥ; no doubt *Zanu'*, 3½ miles S. of Ẓor'āh. On the ע for ן see Kampffmeyer, xv. 25 f.

5. 'En-gannim. *D.B.* and *E.B.* both state that it was identified by Clermont-Ganneau[1] with *Umm-Jinā*, 2 miles S.W. of Ẓor'ah, but without apparently endorsing the identification. It 'might perhaps be' Umm-Jīnā, says Buhl (p. 194 f.). Placed there in the P.E.F. map, G. A. Smith's map, and Murray's map. In the map of Judah in *E.B.* marked there also, but (N.B.) with (??) attached. Any one who reads Clermont-Ganneau's own discussion of the site must surely see that the grounds for the identification are very conjectural. Whatever *Jīnā* may mean (Clermont-Ganneau says the *Jinns*), it has no connexion with *gannim* (gardens).

6. Tappuaḥ. Site unknown (Armstrong, Steuernagel, and Wilson, in *D.B.*, *s.v.*), and not marked on the maps. Said in *H.G.* 202 *n.* 1 to be in the W. el-'Afranj. But is not the *Tuffuḥ* in this valley, 4 miles W. of Hebron, rather the Beth-tappuaḥ of Jos 15[53], in the 'hill-country'?

7. 'Enām. Placed in P.E.F. map, with a (?), at *Khurbet W. 'Alîn*, or the Ruins of Wady 'Alîn, 2 miles slightly W. of N. of Zanoaḥ.[2] Located here by Conder in *Handbook to the Bible* (1879), p. 410. But in Murray's *Dict. of the Bible* (1909), the same writer locates it in an entirely different situation, at '*Kefr 'Ana*, 6 miles N.W. of Sorek,' and 7 miles W.N.W. of Ẓor'āh; and in *D.B.* iii. 648, at '*Ain 'Ainah* (which I cannot find). Placed at Kh. W. 'Alîn, but *without* the (?), in the map of Judah in *H.G.*, in Murray's map, and in the *D.B.* map. But in the *text* of *H.G.* 202 *n.* 'Enām is said to be 'not properly identified,' and it is omitted in Smith's large wall-map. Steuernagel says that the site is unknown. In *D.B.* and *E.B.*, *s.v.*, nothing more definite is said than that (see Gn 38[14]) 'Enām was between 'Adullam and the Timnah of Gn 38[13]. This, however, will have been (notice *went up*, *goeth up*, in Gn 28[12. 13]) the Timnah (now *Tibna*),[3] 4 miles N.E. of 'Aid el-mâ, and 5 miles S.E. of Kh. Wady 'Alîn; so that, if this be 'Enām, and (see below) '*Aid el-mâ* 'Adullam, it will have been anything but 'between' 'Adullam and Timnah. The uncertainty in the site of 'Enām must be obvious. Yet the maps in *H.G.* and *D.B.*, and Murray's map, all mark it as certain.

8. Yarmuth. No doubt *Yarmuk*, 1 mile S. of Zanoaḥ. Cf., on the *k*, Kampffmeyer, xvi. 2, 45.

9. 'Adullam. Clermont-Ganneau in 1871 discovered, 4 miles S.E. of Yarmuk, a ruined site called '*Aid el-mâ*, which he conjectured to represent the Biblical 'Adullam—the ancient name having been transformed by a 'popular etymology' (Buhl, 193; *P.E.F.Q.St.* 1875, 177). The identification is conjectural, but the situation would suit; and it has been generally accepted. But it ought not to be marked on a map without a (?). It is not marked at all in the map of Judah in *E.B.* Cf. *H.G.* 229 f.

10. Socoh. No doubt *'esh-Shuweike*—a *diminutive* form (Kampffmeyer, xvi. 2, 66)—2 miles S. of Yarmuk.

11. 'Azēḳah. Not in the P.E.F. map. In G. A. Smith's map, *D.B.* map, and Murray's map, marked at *Zakariyā*, 2 miles S.W. of Zanoaḥ. But in *D.B.*, *s.v.* (Conder), no identification is proposed; and *H.G.* 202 *n.* says, 'not properly identified.' We have thus two other instances of the text and the map in one and the same volume contradicting each other.

12. Sha'araim. Placed in P.E.F. map, with a (?), at the ruined site *Sha'ireh*, 3½ miles E.S.E. of Zanoaḥ. In the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, marked at *Sha'ireh*, but *without* the (?). Not marked in either of G. A. Smith's maps; and according to *H.G.* 202 *n.* 'not properly identified.' In *D.B.*, *s.v.* (Wilson), no identification accepted.

[1] *Archæol. Researches in Palestine* (P.E.F.) ii. 207 f.

[2] In either both the 1 in. and ⅝ in. to the mile maps of Palestine, or in G. A. Smith's map, Zanoaḥ must be incorrectly located; in the former it is slightly *East* of S. of Kh. W. 'Alîn, in the latter it is considerably *West* of S. of it.

[3] And not the Timnah of Samson (Jg 14[1], etc.), which was 4 miles W. of Kh. W. 'Alîn, and far *lower* than 'Aid el-mâ.

13. 'Adithaim. Unknown (*D.B.*, *E.B.*), and, so far as I can discover, not shown on the maps. In the P.E.F. *Memoirs*, ii. (1882) 322, identified by Conder with *Ḥaditheh*, 3 miles E. of Lydda; but in *D.B.* i. (1898), *s.v.*, the same writer says that the site is unknown! The contradiction, like those in regard to 'Enām, throws light on the value of some of these supposed 'identifications.'

14. Gedērah. Marked in the P.E.F. map, G. A. Smith's map, Murray's map, and *D.B.* map at *Jedireh*, 4½ miles N.N.W. of Ẓor'ah. This seems much more probable than the more distant *Ḳuṭra* —which, moreover, does not agree phonetically[1]— 13 miles W.N.W. of Ẓor'ah, in the maritime plain, apparently preferred in *E.B.*

15. Gedērothaim. The subscription mentions only *fourteen* cities, so no doubt there is here some textual error. The name may, for instance, be a corrupt repetition of *Gedērah*, or an error for גדרתיה (LXX), 'its sheep-folds.'

A map in which, out of fourteen names taken at random, the sites of five are in the highest degree questionable and uncertain, cannot be said to attain a high standard of accuracy. I have often, besides, also noticed sites confidently assigned on the current maps of Palestine, which, upon looking into the grounds upon which they rest, I have found to be equally problematical: in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. 332 f., I gave a list of nearly thirty such sites of places mentioned in the Book of Judges.[2] I have little doubt that many other equally doubtful sites could be found. A map ought to be trustworthy: it is of little real use if no less well-known site marked upon it can be relied upon until hours have been spent in searching out the grounds on which it depends, and ascertaining whether they are sufficient. The only English maps of Palestine which, so far as I have examined them, can be implicitly relied upon are those in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. If I may say so without presumption, even G. A. Smith's map needs some revision; Murray's map and the *D.B.* map need not revision merely, but drastic expurgation. These maps are admirably designed and engraved; but what chartographer, however skilful he may be in the technique of his own profession, can estimate the grounds — philological, critical, historical, or exegetical — upon which, in cases where the *name* has not been unambiguously preserved, the probability of a proposed identification depends? It is to be feared that the authorities of the P.E.F. are responsible in some measure for the confusion; and that the map-makers who have adopted their identifications have not sufficiently considered that, however highly qualified a man may be to survey and describe a *modern* country, he is not on this account equally qualified to estimate the grounds for the identification of a given modern site with an *ancient* place. And when Murray's map and the *D.B.* map are both stated to be 'according to Palestine Exploration Survey,' this is incorrect, and asserts for the map an authority which it does not possess. All that the 'Palestine Exploration Survey' has done is to determine the configuration and sites of the *modern country*,—and, as every one knows, it has done this work most admirably; but it is no function of a 'survey' to determine what *ancient* places any of these sites represent. In some cases the identity of the modern with the ancient site depends upon a well-established, continuous historical tradition; in other cases it depends upon a probable, or, it may be, a very improbable, conjecture; but in none of these cases is the identity, whether real or imaginary, a matter which falls within the scope of a 'survey'; and the confidence which the details of the 'survey' rightly command cannot be claimed for the many hypothetical, and often questionable, identifications with which these maps are crowded. There are cases, also, as noticed above, in which these maps do the P.E.F. map the injustice of adopting from it ancient sites *without* the (?) by which the compilers of that map have guarded themselves. This is a practice deserving strong reprobation. It surely must be evident that for the construction of a map of Palestine including ancient sites, the professional map-maker needs a competent scholar at his side, to advise him what proposed 'identifications' deserve to be accepted by him. Murray's map is a convenient one, as it is handy in size, and shows the elevations (which are important for the history);

[1] The equation, writes Kampffmeyer, *Z.D.M.G.* xvi. (1893) p. 31, is 'recht zweifelhaft.'

[2] The rock of 'Eṭām (Jg 15[8]), for instance, was a place to which Samson 'went down' from Timnah (v.[6]; cf. 14[1. 5]); but Beit-'Aṭab, 5 miles E. of Zanoaḥ, the favourite site for 'Eṭām on the maps (but not in the map in *H.G.*, and in the wall-map only with a ?) is some 1200 feet *above* it! (cf. *H.G.* 222). The ups and downs of the Shephēlah country are vividly reflected in the stories of Samson; and here, as elsewhere in the O.T., the 'went up' and 'came down' should always be carefully noted by the reader. Cf. *H.G.* chap. x.

but it is full of pitfalls for the unwary, and must always be used with extreme caution. The map in Buhl's *Geographie* (1896) contains, unfortunately, only modern sites. A critical map of Palestine, on a convenient scale, and containing only those ancient sites which are either certain or reasonably probable, is still, as it was in 1892 (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiii. 460), a desideratum of Biblical students. Let us hope that some adequately qualified scholar will come forward and produce it.

Contributions and Comments.

The Muhammadan 'Corner.'

ALTHOUGH the word 'corner' in the commercial sense is of United States origin, the thing which it denotes is of immemorial antiquity. A primitive example of it which will occur to every one is that of Joseph in Egypt. In the East this operation is confined to foodstuffs, the demand for other commodities not being sufficiently stringent, and it is forbidden by the law of Islām. It is thus defined in the *Tenbīh al-Ghāfilīn* (*Warning to the Negligent*) of Samarqandi (d. 1003 A.D.):

'Cornering (*ḥukrah*) means buying provisions in a town and holding them without selling, although the people require them. This is to form a corner, and it is forbidden. But if the grain be the produce of one's own estate, or be imported from another town, this is not a corner. Still, if public necessity require it, the grain must be sold. Should the owner refuse to sell he becomes guilty of evil intention towards the Muslims and of want of consideration for them. He must then be forced to sell, and if he refuse he must be scourged and punished, and even then he may not sell at his own price, but at the market rate. For even the Apostle of God said, I do not fix prices, but he who fixes prices is God.'

This regulation is founded on traditional sayings of Muhammad such as the following:—He who makes a corner in grain is a sinner: He who corners foodstuffs for a period of forty days has done with God, and God has done with him: The importer shall be blessed, but the cornerer is cursed,—the 'importer' being defined as the merchant who purchases foodstuffs with the intention of selling them, and imports them to his own locality and sells them. Muhammad is also reported to have warned one of his disciples not to apprentice his son to a grain merchant, on the ground that it were better for him to meet death whilst engaged in drinking wine, or in some other crime, than to meet it just after he happened to have cornered grain for forty nights. Malik ibn Anas (d. 795 A.D.) mentions in the *Muwaṭṭa* that Omar and Othmān, the second and third khalifs, also prohibited corners in food.

These recommendations of Muhammad and his followers were far from remaining a dead letter. One of the officials of the Muslim municipality is the *moḥtasib*, whose duty it is to regulate the price of commodities, and in times of scarcity to find out hidden stores of grain and bring them to the market. The Egyptian Government frequently imported corn from Syria to counteract the effects of a low Nile, and if that failed to bring down prices, the grain speculators were flogged until they sold their supplies at the government rate. The *moḥtasib* himself, however, was sometimes interested in the trade. This was the case at Medina when Burckhardt visited it (*Travels in Arabia*, vol. ii. p. 248 f.). The whole subject is treated in the *Hedaya* of Marghīnāni (d. 1197 A.H.), English translation by Charles Hamilton, 2nd ed. p. 605 ff.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow.

Stephen Langton's Death.

I.

I WROTE *re* this query to my friend the Rev. Charles Woodruff, at the Dean and Chapter Library, Canterbury, who replies this morning: 'I don't know that I shall be able to settle the question as to the date of Archbishop Langton's death from our records. The Monastic Registers do not begin so early as 1228, though we have any number of earlier charters, and of course it might be possible to fix the date from them, though it may take time to find out.'

RICHARD COOKE.

Maidstone.

II.

Dr. Nestle's question is anticipated by Miss Kate Norgate—than whom no better authority—in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* xxxii., *s.v.* LANGTON (STEPHEN): 'The dates of his death and burial are given by the chroniclers of the time in a strangely conflicting and self-contradictory way; the most probable solution of the puzzle seems to be that he died on 9th July 1228, and was buried on 15th at Canterbury.'

C. S. WARD.

Bury St. Edmunds.

An Englishman.

As the author of one of the books in Messrs. Morgan & Scott's 'Missionary Series,' I should like to thank you for your reference in the current number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 512. Your reviewer is, however, misinformed when he states that I am an American. I have great admiration for that virile nation, but confess that I prefer to remain what I am—an Englishman. In writing my book, *Christ the Desire of Nations*, I found great stimulus and help from articles in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, and DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS, as well as THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDGAR W. DAVIS.

Banbury.

The Coat without Seam.

I.

DR. NESTLE says that he has looked in vain in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE for some elucidation of the seamless robe. But the garment is discussed and illustrated in article DRESS, i. 625. And reference to that article is made under COAT and under CLOKE in the Index.

H. S. MARWICK.

II.

Dr. Nestle's interpretation of the coat without seam from the top, which he fails to find elsewhere, is in Luthardt's Commentary, 'ὁ χιτών, the shirt-like undergarment, was ἄρραφος, without seam from above, that is, from the opening for the neck.'

GEO. A. DERRY.

The Palace, Derry.

Chronology of the Old Testament in the English Bible.

IN the article 'Chronology of the Old Testament' (*D.B.* i. 398), I find a lacuna.

Think of a Bible reader who uses one of the many editions of the A.V., which give on the margins the years B.C. If he compares them with the tables in that article, what does he find?

	A.V.	*D.B.*	Result.
1. Years from the Creation to the Flood .	4004–2348 = 1656	1656	=
2. From Flood to Birth of Abraham . .	2348–1996 = 352	290	+ 62
3. From the Birth of Abraham to Exodus	1996–1491 = 505	720	− 215
4. Total from the Creation to Exodus .	4004–1491 = 2513	2666	− 153

How are these differences to be explained? That they are not explained, not even mentioned, in the said article seems to me the lacuna.

The differences come from three places:

(*a*) From Gn 10^{10} 'Shem was 100 years old and begat Arphaxad *2 years* after the flood.' These *2* years are not reckoned in the *D.B.*; attention, however, is called to them in the footnote of p. 398*a*.

(*b*) From the internal inconsistency between Gn 11^{26} and 12^{4}. The article of the *D.B.* reckons from the birth of Terah to the entrance of Abraham into Canaan—

70 + 75 years . .	145
The A.V. 130 + 75 „ . .	205

making a plus of 60.

(*c*) The sojourn in Egypt is reckoned in the *D.B.* at 430, in the A.V. at 215 years, making a minus of 215.

Thus we have + 2 + 60 − 215 = − 153.

A word, too, might have been said in that article on the origin of the chronological figures in the A.V. In the art. 'English Versions' (Extra Vol. p. 257) it is shortly mentioned that dates were for the first time added in the margin in the folio of 1701, revised by Bishop Lloyd, 'taken in the main from Ussher.' As Scrivener in his *Introduction to the Paragraph Bible* informs us: 'Bp. Lloyd's dates have not been materially tampered with, since they were first brought into our Bible, though in some copies they are repeated more frequently than in others.' Scrivener gives there some examples of changed figures. Zech (chap. 9),

for instance, was attributed by Lloyd to 587, since 1836 to 517, in Bagster's edition of 1846 to 510, in the American edition of 1867 to 487. Scrivener himself puts a mark of interrogation to this and some other questionable dates, and adds a few dates in brackets, as '[B.C. 177]' at Est 11^1.

It seems to me a pity that even such editions of the A.V. as increased the passages to which dates are given, for instance, the Variorum Bible, show in another respect a painful *capiti diminutio*; all figures referring to the reckoning of the Septuagint are left out in the first six books. At Gn 1^1, for instance, Scrivener gives: 'B.C. 4004 Hebrew, 5586 (?) Greek'; at 7^{10}: B.C. 2349 Hebrew, B.C. 3347 (?) Greek'; and so on 8^{13}; 12^1: 1921, 2040, etc. All other editions which I can consult give now only, 'B.C. 4004, 2349, 1921.' Has it been considered dangerous to call attention to a fact which earlier times openly acknowledged? I hope the approaching jubilee of the A.V. will give us the history of these dates.

To call attention to the difference in the reckoning of the birth of Abraham seems the more necessary, since Kittel in the new edition of the Herzog-Hauck *Encyclopedia*, xxi. 641, has not a syllable on it, while in the second edition G. Rösch (xvii. 454) had devoted more than a page to this question. I trust the American edition will make good this fault. Truly, Ussher's reckoning, taken over into the A.V., is not such a *quantité négligeable*.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. David Reid, B.D., St. John's United Free Church, Leith, and the Rev. J. Evans, Pwllheli, North Wales, to each of whom a copy of Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit* will be sent; and by the Rev. F. W. Boreham, Hobart, Tasmania, to whom a copy of Adams's *Israel's Ideal* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for October must be received by [illegible] 1st of September. The text is Ps 4^6.

The Great Text for November is Ps $8^{3,4}$:

'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps $9^{9,10}$:

'The Lord also will be a high tower for the oppressed,
A high tower in times of trouble;
And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee;
For thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee.'

A copy of Durell's *Self-Revelation of our Lord*, or two volumes of Plummer's *English Church History*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 11^3:

'If the foundations be destroyed,
What can the righteous do?'

A copy of Forrest's *Authority of Christ*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for February is Ps 14^1:

'The fool hath said in his heart,
There is no God.'

A copy of any volume of the 'International Theological Library,' or of the 'International Critical Commentary,' will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

47,386

DEMCO

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY